ASHERAH AND ASTARTE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND UGARITIC LITERATURES

A dissertation by

Alice Lenore Perlman

presented to
The Faculty of the
Graduate Theological Union
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Berkeley, California
February 1978

Committee Signatures:

William J. Fulco
Coordinator

Victor Roland Gold

Guitty Azarpay

Jacob Milgrom

John E. Huesman

For my parents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS iii

INTRODUCTION 1

    Notes 5

I. ASHERAH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT 6

    Notes 35

II. AṮIRAT AT UGARIT 39

    Notes 87

INTRODUCTION TO CHAPTERS III AND IV 97

    Notes 99

III. ASTARTE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT 100

    Notes 124

IV. ASTARTE AT UGARIT 129

    Notes 171

CONCLUSION 183

    Notes 190

EXCURSUS: ASTARTE IN EGYPT 191

    Notes 201

BIBLIOGRAPHY 203

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADS	*Le Antiche Divinita Semitiche*, S. Moscati, ed. [*Studi Semitici*, I] Rome, 1958.
AfO	*Archiv für Orientalia*.
ANEP	*Ancient Near East in Pictures*. Pritchard, J. B., 1954.
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts Related to the Old Testament*. Pritchard, J. B. Princeton, 1969.
AOAT	*Alter Orient und Altes Testament*.
ARI	W. F. Albright. *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*.
"Aštart,"	Hermann, W., "Aštart," *Mitteilungen des Institutes für Orient Forschung*, 15 (1969).
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*.
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*.
BOS	U. Cassuto, *Biblical and Oriental Studies*, vol. II. 1975.
CAD	*Chicago Assyriological Dictionary*.
CanMyth	G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, 1956.
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*.
CGSL	S. Moscati, *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, 1969.
CMHE	F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Harvard, 1973.
CRAIBL	*Comptes rendus des séances de l'academie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*.
CTA	A. Herdner, *Corpus des Tablettes en Cuneiformes Alphabetiques* [*Mission de Ras Shamra X.*] Paris, 1963.
de Moor	
AOAT 16,	*The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba^{c}lu*. 1971.
NYCI	*New Year with Canaanites and Israelites*, pts. 1 and 2.
"Pantheon"	"The Semitic Pantheon of Ugarit," *UF* 2 (1970).
Studies I,	"Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra," *UF* 1 (1969).
Studies II,	"Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra," *UF* 2 (1970).

EHSP I. J. Gelb, "Early History of the Semitic Peoples," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 15 (1961).

ESP J. J. M. Roberts, *The Earliest Semitic Pantheon*.

GAG G. von Soden, *Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik*. 1969.

Gibson J. C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*. Oxford, 1975.

HTR *Harvard Theological Review*.

HUCA *Hebrew Union College Annual*.

IEJ *Israel Exploration Journal*.

JANES *Journal of the American Near Eastern Society*. Columbia Univ.

JAOS *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

JBL *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

JCS *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*.

JEA *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*.

JNES *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*. Chicago.

JPOS *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*. London.

JSS *Journal of Semitic Studies*.

KAI H. A. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische un Aramäische Inschriften* 3 vols., 1966.

MKT J. Aistleitner, *Die mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Shamra*.

PEQ *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*.

PNU F. Gröndahl, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit*. 1967.

Praep. Ev. C. Clemen, "Die phönikische Religion nach Philo von Byblos."

PRU *Palais Royale d'Ugarit*.

RB *Revue Biblique*.

RHA *Le Revue Hittite et Asianique*.

RSP I and II *Ras Shamra Parallels*. L. Fisher, ed.

SPGE R. Stadelmann, *Syrische-pälestinische Gottheiten in Ägypten*. 1967.

UF *Ugarit-Forschungen*.

UG V *Ugaritica V*, [*Mission de Ras Shamra XVI*.] Paris, 1968.

Ug-H Phil, M. Dahood, *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology*. 1965.

UgM J. Obermann, *Ugaritic Mythology*. 1948.

UgM&E H. L. Ginsberg, "Ugaritic Myths," in *ANET*.

UL C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Literature*. 1949.

UT C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, 3 vols. 1965.

VT *Vetus Testamentum*.

WdM *Wörterbuch der Mythologie*. W. Haussig, ed.

Whitaker R. Whitaker, *A Concordance of the Ugaritic Literature*. 1973.

WUS J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch der Ugaritischen Sprache*.

YGC W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*. 1968.

ZDPV *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-vereins*.

INTRODUCTION

Asherah and Astarte are two goddesses known by readers of the Hebrew Bible and other literatures of the Ancient Near East. We conceive of them as mother-goddesses, goddesses of fertility, love and, at times, war. Typically interpreters of ancient religion stereotype each female deity as bearing or embodying some procreative power and function. How accurate are our notions of Asherah and Astarte and have we perhaps been led astray by modern categories? A fresh unprejudiced examination of the subject and materials is called for. In this paper I will consider the goddesses Asherah and Astarte as unique entities within particular milieus as recorded in Ugaritic and Old Testament literatures. I regard these literatures as reflecting and recording unique religious forms and traditions of specific cultures.

While we are obligated to recognize cultures as dynamic systems subject to internal and external forces we can describe certain activities for a specific moment. Statements regarding cultural phenomena may be true for that time only; all we see at a given moment is an interface. It is that surface or space that lies between two others and forms a common boundary. When we refer to religion and other institutions we, on the outside, tend to look for the hybrid nature of the form asking from where it came and how it relates to earlier and later forms. The ancient participant was concerned with the whole at that moment. This is important to remember because scholars and critics of ancient religions center their efforts on determining common sources and unity of forms over time and space. Deities of common name in several locales are assumed to be a single god, or gods of different names but similar function are said to be related or derivative.[1] We need to ask how they function in a particular culture at a certain time. We must be sensitive to generally accepted and often invalid assumptions and interpretations extrapolated from questionable sources.

If one were to read any book or article on ancient Near Eastern religion under the subheading "Asherah" or "Astarte", it would be immediately apparent that scholars know a great deal about these goddesses. Or do they? W. F. Albright[2] calls Astarte a war goddess. J. J. M. Roberts[3] agrees. John Gray[4] claims she is a goddess of love and war. The goddess described is obviously Mesopotamian Ištar, the goddess of love and war. Recently W. Hermann[5] claimed Astarte's attributes were those of war and as the upholder of human justice. The question we must ask is, does the evidence in the Hebrew Bible and the Ugaritic literature warrant such interpretations and equation with Ištar? I think not. We must examine the evidence as we find it, with no preconceived notions of the way Astarte is supposed to behave. It will become clear that Astarte ought not be equated with Ištar.

Asherah has also been unjustly treated. Her position as Mother of the gods in the Ugaritic texts is but one of her interesting features. The texts reveal a great deal more information to the reader. Asherah in the Old Testament has been given some careful examination[6] but I hope to elucidate an ancient confusion in terminology which has persisted to this day.

I have chosen to examine the two largest corpora of Northwest Semitic literature for several reasons. The quantity of texts provides more entries for each goddess than the inscriptional materials, and in isolating the dieties in specific milieus this is important. There are also well established methodologies for Old Testament study. Form critical methods and lexical studies and derived methods of analysis will yield a portrayal of the goddesses' place in the thinking of the Old Testament writers and editors in a new light. We should caution at the outset that precious little of the deities remains for us to discover.

Ugaritic studies, still in many respects in their infancy, have not yet developed such exegetical methods though in time these will be necessary. However, assuming less editorial and theologically prejudiced tampering than is found in the OT such critical methods are not as necessary; the inhabitants of Ugarit saw deities as vital and active and represented them as such. There was no attempt to empty them of life and force. Finally, the application of several methodologies is an interesting exercise in so far as one must constantly check oneself against blanket application of critical formulae.

The time differential between Ugaritic and Hebrew literature is a question which is potentially the single largest problem in this study. I do not in any way intend this paper to be a comparison of the two literatures and religious systems; I hope future scholars will consider the propriety of such studies. Time itself is enough reason to preclude such inquiry though just those comparisons and equations are made repeatedly by scholars of the ancient world. By juxtaposing Hebrew and Ugaritic literature in the study of Asherah and Astarte it will become patently clear that in at least these matters we are dealing with markedly distinct religious traditions together with their inherent implications of theology, function of literature, literary form and intention. It is,

UMI

of course, undeniable that a commonality existed. However, I do not intend a study which seems always to imply Israel's closet of pagan skeletons. What Israel intended in the Old Testament writings and what she perceived is our interest here. The Ugaritic sections will be more descriptive than interpretive. We must take the myths, epics and other genres of literature at face value since no commonly accepted exegetical methods have been developed.

NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

1. Cf. e.g., the efforts of Robert du Mesnil du Buisson, *Études sur les dieux phéniciens héretés par l'empire romain*. Leiden, Brill, 1970.

2. *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, 132-134.

3. *Earliest Semitic Pantheon*, 39-40.

4. *The Legacy of Canaan*, 129.

5. "Aštart," in *MIO* 15(1969), passim.

6. William Reed, *The Asherah in the Old Testament*, Texas, 1949.

Chapter I

ASHERAH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Many scholars have discussed the *'šrh/ym* in the *OT* in the attempt to determine its origin and nature.[1] Does the *'šrh* denote a goddess or a cult object or some combination of the two? The question has been dealt with in various ways, through the use and study of extra-Biblical materials, *LXX* study and lexical studies. William Reed, in *Asherah in the Old Testament*,[2] determined satisfactorily that the *'šrh*, in the majority of cases in the OT, was a physical object which was man-made and probably of wood. The verbs associated with the *'šrh*, either building or destroying it, occur regularly and are construed in other pericopes with known wooden or stone objects. The proof of its physical nature is well established in a number of texts. Its form and design are not at present known. We also do not know how the Canaanites conceived of the *'šrh*, assuming it was of Canaanite manufacture and origin.[3] Was it merely a cult object as the altar or did it embody the numenous presence of the Semitic goddess Asherah known from the Ugaritic texts and other West Semitic literatures? The Israelites, or Hebrew redactors of the *OT*, seem to have conceived of it as an object although there is also evidence that in certain periods and at certain places a goddess Asherah was worshipped.

The problem at hand is then to determine which references in scripture refer to an object and which to a goddess. With an initial assumption that *'šrh/ym* can refer to either an object or a goddess we have two distinct entities with but one lexical referent. If we can determine two lexical entries, the object and the goddess, we can find parallels and support from comparative Semitics.

The root *'šr* (*'aṯr*) can be found in most Semitic lexica meaning "place" in general or sometimes a holy precinct or holy place. In addition, many of the literatures know a goddess *'šrh* or *'ṯrt*. Clearly, at least superficially, the two items derive from the same root *'š/ṯr*. Whether the goddess is the deity of the holy place or the deification of the place, or if the two items are merely homonyms is unknown. It is important that in the Semitic languages, with the apparent exception of Classical Hebrew, there were two distinct lexical items which remained separate and unique.[4]

The Greek rendering of *'šrh/ym* in the *LXX* is *alšos*. This word has been slavishly translated "groves" or "poles". Some suggest that this translation cannot work; one cannot build a grove. However, to reduce a grove to a pole or cultic standard is not true to the Greek either. The assumption behind such a translation was that the object set up or built had to be related to the goddess Asherah.[5] The word *alšos* has several other meanings including a sacred precinct with or without trees. This may be closer to the meaning intended by the Greek translators of the *OT*.

Given the possibility that *'šrh/ym* can mean a sacred place or precinct we have then to determine which scriptural entries refer to the "place" or sanctuary and which if any to a goddess called Asherah. The *OT* texts, which present myriad problems in exegesis, seem to fall roughly into two groups, those with the singular, *'šrh*, and those with the plural *'šrym*. While the division is not perfect and there is some overlap, it provides a good starting place and referent for the following exegesis.

With only two exceptions, the singular *'šrh* refers to a specific known object or to the goddess whose prophets Jezebel retained. The specific objects were those erected by Maacha, Ahab and Manasseh and those same objects which were removed in the course of the religious reforms of Asa and Josiah. They were objects placed inside the Temple. To the list of singulars we can add Gideon's activities at Ophrah in the course of which the local sanctuary was destroyed and replaced by one devoted to Israel's god.

The two exceptions are, Dt 16:21 which prohibited the implanting of an *'šrh* (or better, "any" *'šrh*), and 2 Ki 17:16 which chronicles Israel's fall: the establishment of an *'šrh* was one of the events which precipitated the end of the Northern Kingdom.

The plural, *'šrym*, is more general in the its application. In the legal codes of Exodus and Deuteronomy, they are the objects or perhaps the structures belonging to other people, to foreigners who do not worship the god of Israel. In the historical narratives they form part of the expressions of general condemnation and catalogue of the faults which led to the destruction of the two kingdoms. They charge the monarchs and the people with setting up *'šrym* in the country-side and on the hills. We find these items in the history of the fall of Samaria, the sins of Rehaboam, Joash and Manasseh.

In the texts which detail the reforms of the "good" kings the use of the plural *'šrym* appears in descriptions of the destruction of the foreign cult objects. Hezekiah destroyed the *mzbḥwt*, *mṣbwt*, *'šrym* and *bmwt*; Jehoshaphat and Josiah are said to have done the same. The places where the purges took place are never specifically named; they are the cities of Ephraim and Judah and the area around Jerusalem. Likewise, when the *'šrym* are established in the land they are set up on "every high hill" or in "every city."

One verse states that an *'šrh* could fit inside a larger structure.[6] It refers to the object made by Manasseh. 1 Ki 15:13 (= 2 Ch 15:16) and 2 Ki 21:7 suggest an image was set up either to or for Asherah worship but not that it was an *'šrh*. Though the above two passages are the most suggestive of the use of the word *'šrh* for the worship of Asherah the goddess they are by no means conclusive. The image, *mplṣt* of 1 Ki 15:13 and the *pśl* of 2 Ki 21:7 are not synonymous with *'šrh*. Other pericopes contain words for idols and images in addition to *'šrh*. One must assume then that the *'šrh/ym* and other objects were considered distinct entities.[7]

The feminine plural occurs three times. In Ju 3:7 it is preferable to read *^{c}štrwt* with 2 MSS Heb and *Vulgate*. In 2 Ch 33:3 it is a plural built on the singular of 2 Ki 21:3. 2 Ch 19:3 is an independent text which has no parallels in Kings. The *^{c}šrwt* of 2 Ch have the same general use as the masculine plural *'šrym*.

In the Deuteronomic (Dtr) sources, with the possible exceptions of 1 Ki 18:19, 2 Ki 23:4ff and 1 Ki 15:13, there are no indications that a goddess Asherah was worshipped. 2 Ki 23:7 states that there were temple personnel devoted to some apsect of *'šrh* upkeep, whether to a cult devoted to her or to the maintenance of a cult object or to a place is not clear.[8]

The notice in 1 Ki 18:19 gives us a figure of 400 prophets of

Asherah who sat at Jezebel's table. Jezebel was a Sidonian. From 1 Ki 16:33 it seems that Ahab instituted the worship of Baal and perhaps also of Asherah.[9] It was probably a Northern variety of Baal and Asherah worship which he introduced since some form of Baal was worshipped from early times (cf. Nu 25; Ju 9). *'šrym* were built in both Israel and Judah as early as Jeroboam and Asa (1 Ki 14:15 and 1 Ki 15:13). It seems that in the Ahab pericopes *'šrh* is used as a proper name. In 1 Ki 15:13 an object was either made and devoted to Asherah or it was an *'šrh*.[10] The *'šrh* was both object and goddess though not necessarily at the same time or at the same place. For the Northerners and foreigners *'šrh* as a goddess was probably a specific Asherah of Sidon.

Outside the books of Kings and Chronicles we find the *'šrym* mentioned four times in the Pentateuch: Dt 7:5, 12:3, 16:21 and Ex 34:13. With the exception of Dt 16:21 which, as stated above, prohibits establishing an *'šrh*, the other pericopes require the conquering Israelites to destroy the cult objects and cult sites of the inhabitants of the land. If Hezekiah and Josiah initiated their reforms in accordance with instructions of an ancient law, it was probably one similar to one of those extant in the Pentateuch. We can go further in establishing the connection between the reforms and the origin of the expression used by the Deuteronomist by examining the vocabulary and semantic ranges of certain words used in the expression. The semantic range of the word *'šrym* in the expressions will enable us to see it as an item distinct from the name of the goddess Asherah.

We have tentatively determined that the words *'šrh* and *'šrym* are separate lexical items which function in different contexts. The singular 'šrh, found primarily in the Dtr literature refers to man-made objects established by apostate kings or to the goddess Asherah of the Ahab-Jezebel pericopes. The plural 'šrym appears in expressions which detail the religious reforms of the Judahite kings. Those expressions, we will determine, derive from the Pentateuchal laws of Exodus 34 and Deuteronomy 7 and 12. At this point there is no conclusive evidence to associate the goddess Asherah with all occurances of either 'šrh or 'šrym.

Repetition, stability of vocabulary, word usage, context, are words which describe and define the requisites for a formula or formulaic expression. If we find the same set of words (verbs, nouns, modifiers) used and repeated many times with little alteration in several books of the OT it is legitimate to call it a formula. The words are used repeatedly to describe or express a particular activity or concept. Synonyms could easily have been used but were not chosen. In the case at hand the formula describes the action taken against foreign cult objects, specifically the mzbḥ, mṣbwt and 'šrym.

As we shall see the expression is stable though its composition changes a bit. Some members drop out or are replaced but there is always some recognizable feature referring us back to an original expression. There are, then, certain slots into which any one of several words can be placed. All the nouns are cult objects of a type detestable to Israel's Yahweh cult. There is a finite number of nouns and they are to be found primarily in Deuteronomy's (Dt) list of cult objects.[11] The action verbs employed to describe the destruction of the objects are also stable, i.e., particular verbs are associated with certain nouns. We find *šbr* with *mṣbh* and never with *mzbh*, *krt* and *gd*^{c} with *'šrh* and never with *mzbḥ* or *mṣbh*. In the narratives which describe the action taken against foreign cult objects the formula may be broken up and spread throughout several verses (2 Ki 23:4ff) but the vocabulary remains intact. The verse construction has obviously been influenced by earlier injunctions. This stability of expression is the primary reason why we can call Ex 34:13; Dt 7:5, and Dt 12:3 formulaic expressions. It is reasonable then to assume, as have most critics, that the redactor of the historical books followed the format set forth in Dt or was greatly influenced by Dt's content and phraseology.

The word *'šrh/ym* in Dt and the Dtr books and Chr appears in a formulaic expression.[12] The formula is found in Dt 7:5, 12:3; 2 Ki 18:4ff, 23:12; Ju 6:25ff; 2 Ch 14:3; 15:16ff, 13:1, 34:4ff. It also occurs in the controversial pericope Ex 34:10-16. It is my opinion that Ex 34:13 represents the earliest and purest form of the expression. The formula was subsequently expanded in Dt and Dtr to include an enlarged list of cult objects not found in J or E strands. Dt's polemic against the ritual use of *'šrh*, *mzbḥ* and *mṣbh* derives from J or E[13] or perhaps as Langlamet[14] would say, from a J tradition though not from extant J texts. The J "feeling" is most difficult to prove and in fact there is no real substantial proof of a J strand in Ex 34:10-16.

As noted above, the use of *'šrh* outside the formulaic expression is limited to two areas: 1. the setting up or building of *'šrym* (usually the singular *'šrh*) which is the converse of our destruction formula. The *'šrh*, as well as *mṣbh* and *bmt* are cited in 1 Ki 16:33; 2 Ki 17:9ff, 21:3ff and 2 Ch 37:3, 33:19 as proof of a particular king's apostasy or in 1 Sa 17:8; Jer 17:2; 2 Ch 24:18 of the people's apostasy. 2. It is otherwise considered by itself as an object of disgust. In all other cases *'šrh/ym* is found in contexts directly related to the formula.

The word *'šrym* occurs only four times in the Pentateuch: Ex 34:13; Dt 7:5, 12:3, and 16:21. In all but Dt 16:21 the context is a commandment to destroy foreign cult objects. Dt 16:21 is an admonition against setting up an *'šrh* and monuments to other gods. It is the reverse procedure of Dt 7:5, 12:3 and Ex 34:13.

Exodus 34

Ex 34:11 lists the peoples whom Yahweh will rout before the Israelites. In composition the list is common to many OT verses: Canaanites, Hittites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites. The order of members of this list is rather fluid and appears differently and with some substitutions in J and D. J lists Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites, Perizzites, Hivites, Jebusites. D gives Hittites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites and Jebusites. There are of course exceptions to each of these lists: Dt 7:1 does not follow the D pattern, Ex 13:5 does not correspond with J. The uniqueness of Ex 34:11 does not really indicate its early composition.[15]

Following the list of nations, Israel is warned (v. 12) against making a covenant with any of the conquered peoples. Langlamet discusses *krt brt l....*[16] The ideas the expression embraces are (1.) to grant a covenant to someone or (2.) when the subject is Yahweh, to conclude an alliance to the second party's benefit. In every case the members are one superior and one inferior, i.e. a conqueror and a vanquished. The underlying purpose of the prohibition must be to exclude foreigners from all sectors of Israelite life, especially the cult (v. 13).

Verse 13 includes the instructions for the destruction and elimination of the foreign cult. It is introduced by a rhetorical *ky* which emphasizes the preceding statement and gives the following message as the alternate action. The verse, broken into component parts reads:

1. ky 't mzbḥwtm ttṣwn
2. w't mṣbwtm tšbrwn
3. w't 'šryw tkrtwn
4. (v. 14) ky l' tštḥwh l'l 'ḥr

If the Israelites do make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land they will be invited to partake of sacrifices to other gods (v. 15). The result will be apostasy and intermarriage and the observance of foreign cult practices. The covenant will be the cause of Israel's downfall. The command in verses 12 and 13 to refrain from covenants and to destroy the cult objects are crucial to the social and religious integrity of Israel. If the orders of verses 12 and 13 are obeyed none of the threats of verses 15 and 16 will be fulfilled. The pericope 11-16 is a well constructed unit expressing one idea: justification for Israel's cultic isolation.

According to the author or compiler of the books of Kings, foreign wives of Israel's kings were directly responsible for importing foreign deities and inciting their husbands to stray from pure Yahweh worship. Solomon (1 Ki 11:4-6) built installations for the worship of foreign deities and the Dtr compiler in 1 Ki 11:11 held his apostasy responsible for the break-up of the kingdom. Jeroboam, though never accused of worship of foreign gods, is responsible in the final analysis for the original and decisive sin of the Northern Kingdom--the establishment of cult places to rival Jerusalem. However, he didn't have a foreign wife and he did not worship other gods. Ahab's wife Jezebel introduced Asherah worship and presumably with his consent, persecuted the prophets of Yahweh. While Ahab's political career was very successful his religious sins were the results of a "bad" marriage (1 Ki 21:25). Athaliah too was responsible for some cultic deviation, but she was related to Jezebel and Ahab and therefore could not help it. The same was true for Ahaziah (1 Ki 22:51ff). These cases, and others, follow very closely the dire predictions made in Ex 34 and Dt 7. If Israel intermarries with the inhabitants of the land, the foreign wives will cause the sons of Israel to stray after other gods and forget Yahweh. Where Ex 34 does not state the outcome of apostasy, Dt 7 is very explicit, Yahweh will destroy Israel. As we are told by the Dtr, the kings did marry foreign wives, they were led astray and Israel was expelled from the land. Manasseh, the worst of the bad, was the only one to promote a foreign cult entirely on his own initiative.[17]

The pericope Ex 34:10-16 has been defined by most scholars as a unit distinct from the surrounding verses.[18] The difficulty and source of controversy in dealing with these verses has been the inability to assign them with certainty to any single editorial strand. Either that pericope derives from another source or the verses parallel to it in Dt and Dtr derive from it or a source common to both.

Langlamet and more recently Wilms[19] are inclined to ascribe the entire pericope Ex 34:10-16 to J. The basis for placing the individual v. 13 with J is not entirely convincing. Langlamet eliminates as original Ju 2:2 and Dt 12:3 (both similar to Ex 34:13 and Dt 7:5) saying that for stylistic reasons they are derivative. It is, he adds, impossible to know if Ex 34:13 cites the complete law.[20] He places the original earlier than Hosea 10:1-8. Hosea presents a picture of divine chastizement, not the execution of a law. However, there is or would be little difference in the mind of ancient Israel and one can see in Hosea's prophecy simply the result hinted at in Dt 7:4b.

Others have placed Ex 34:13 in the context of the Josianic reform. That reform was an internal purge and an attempt to clean up the Israelite cult which necessitated its centralization.[21] Ex 34:13, Dt 7:5 and 12:3 are all directed against the cults of the surrounding or soon to be conquered peoples--the Canaanites, Jebusites, etc., *their* altars, *their* pillars and *their 'šrym*. Why, Langlamet[22] asks, would a successor to Hosea have used different language, assuming Hosea were earlier? One possible reason would be to archaize in order to put the words in Moses' mouth. It could certainly make sense given Ahab's activities in the North. Ahab did marry a foreigner and he did build and erect cult objects. He probably also worshipped Baal. Still there is no reason to place it as late as Josiah since we know prophets earlier than the period of Josiah were railing against improper cult practices. The Josianic period was not the first to be conscious of cultic improprieties and advocate cultic centralization.[23] Finally, Langlamet places the text in the setting of the conquest and early settlement when Israel, in order to maintain religious and social integrity, had to forbid the use and order the destruction of all foreign cult objects.[24] During the period of the monarchy the threat did not come from the "inhabitants" of the land rather from invaders and foreigners brought into Israel. In fact, nowhere does it ever say that apostasy was the result of imitating the cult practices of the Canaanites in the land.

Dealing with the text in this manner there is no way to finally know the *sitz im Leben* of the proscriptions. Any number of events could have generated such a reaction. We can do more, I believe, by examining all related texts (those that contain our formula), especially for cultic vocabulary and word frequency. Hopefully we can arrive at a more precise answer as to derivation and perhaps the date of our first formula and of Asherah worship as it may have existed.

Deuteronomy 7 and 12

Dt 7:1ff describes the same situation as Ex 34:10-16, though the order of events and admonitions is transposed in places. The theme of intermarriage, briefly noted in Ex 34 is expanded in Dt 7 to include the complete exchange of daughters. Ex 34:16 mentions only the taking of Canaanite girls for Israel's sons. The result, though, is the same in both passages. The foreign daughter will cause the Israelite son to stray after "other" gods. The word *znh* "to stray or whore after" in Ex 34:15, 16 is common to E but is never found in D.[25] In D we find words like *hlk* "walk after", *^{c}bd* "to serve" (in a religious sense), and *śwr* "to turn towards", in the context of worshipping other gods.[26]

Dt 7:1 lists the nations whom Israel will dispossess: the Hittites, Girgasites,[27] Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites and

and Jebusites.[28] These peoples are to be put to the ban, *hrm*. The use of *hrm* here is not surprising. The concept is dominant in Dtr though, in the Pentateuch outside of Dt it is very rare. It appears in Nu 18:14 and Lev 27:28 both of which are P. The contexts are not of war. *hrm* also appears in what are thought to be early texts:[29] Ex 22:19 and Nu 21:2-3. In Ex 22:19 sacrifice to any god but Yahweh is punishable by the ban. In Nu 21:2-3 Israel vows, *hrm*, the captured cities to Yahweh. Weinfeld[30] suggests that though the ban was an early concept and found in a context of warfare and soldiers' vows, Dt understood it as an axiomatic decree which applied to all the inahbitants of the land. Ex 34 makes no command to put the inhabitants of the land to the ban. According to that pericope Israel should conquer, expel the inhabitants, destroy cult objects and not intermarry. Dt 7:2b definitely gives a new twist to the pattern presented in Ex 34:10-16. It is unlikely that Ex 34 would have left out something as important as the *hrm* and we can only speculate that D had Ex 34 in hand when it added 7:2b.[31]

There is also a small inconsistency between Dt 7:2b and 3. If all the Canaanites are to be put to the ban[32] verse 3 would be unnecessary as there would be no Canaanite daughters with whom to marry. Since the intention of Dt 7:1-5 is otherwise so similar to Ex 34 it is easy to imagine that D added 2b to the previously established format of Ex 34.[33]

Upon entering Canaan the Israelites were ordered to destroy all temptation (7:5):

1. ky 'm kh t^{c}sw lhm

2. mzbḥwtyhm ttṣw
3. wmṣbwtm tšbrw
4. w'šyrhm tgd^{c}wn
5. wpśylyhm tsrpwn b'š
6. (v. 25) pśyly 'lhyhm tsrpwn b'š

The difference in grammatical structure between Ex 34:13 and Dt 7:5 is slight. Dt 7:5 reads as a list following the statement, "Thus you shall do to them:..." Ex 34:13 seems to be a complete sentence and not a list. The use of possessive pronoun suffixes in 7:5 is not consistent; three members of the list are plurals with plural suffixes. *mṣbwt*, while formally a plural, has taken a suffix normally attached to a singular noun. The vocabulary in this pericope is different from Ex 34. Where Ex 34 uses *krt* with *'šrh*, Dt 7 uses *gd^{c}*. Dt 7 has added *pśl* in two places to the list of objects to be destroyed (verses 5 and 25). The use of fire to destroy the idols is apparently unique to D.[34]

Dt 12 is somewhat different from Dt 7. The expression in 12:2b:

^{c}l hhrym hrmym w^{c}l gb^{c}wt wtḥt kl ^{c}ṣ r^{c}nn

is language typical of Dtr.[35] Dt 12:2 which reads: *hmqwm 'šr ybḥr* and *lswm šmw šm* are also Dtr phrases.[36] The burning of idols is also D's terminology.[37] The context and intent in this pericope is to destroy the foreign cult places in order to establish a centralized cult of Yahweh in some as yet unnamed *mqwm*. Verse 2 tells Israel to destroy all the cult sites while verse 3 commands the destruction of the objects:

1. wntṣtm 't mzbḥwtm
2. wšbrtm 't mṣbwtm
3. w'šryhm tsrpwn b'š
4. wpśyly 'lhyhm tgd^{c}wn

(5. w'bdtm 't šmm mn hmqwm hhw')

Dt 12:3 differs from Dt 7:5 and Ex 34:13 most noticeably in word order. The first two members read verb, 't, object. The third and fourth members read, object, verb. The verse as a whole lacks the rhythm and cohesiveness of the verse in the other two passages. The interchange of verbs and nouns, 'šrym srp and pšl gd^c, does not make sense if we consider Dt 7:5, 25; 2 Ki 19:18f to be Dt and Dtr instructions to burn idols. Nowhere else do we find 'šrym with srp and pšl with gd^c.[38] In Dt and those passages and books influenced or written by Dtr gd^c (or krt) is associated wth 'šrym. Though the fourth noun has a different verb it corresponds in structure and word order to Dt 7:5. The editor of Dt 12:3 drew directly upon Dt 7:5 and 25 for the structure of 3β.[39]

It is clear that Ex 34:13 is closer in structure to Dt 7:5 than to Dt 12:3 which appears to be a composite rather clumsily strung together.[40] Of the three pericopes mentioned, Dt 12:3 is the most corrupt and least likely to be considered original. Which of the two others is original? If it is Ex 34 why did Dt 7 add pšl to the list? If Dt 7 is the earlier why did Ex 34 drop the fourth member? The possibility of the two being contemporary is not likely given the difference in vocabulary mentioned above. A formula such as ours might be expected to contain all the important members. As we shall see, the expression changes through time with new members added and others removed. On those grounds we can account for differences between the two verses. There was a development and change in the components and structure of the formula.

Weinfeld's analysis of Dtr terminology does not consider those sections of Dt, Jos-Kings which parallel Ex 34:13 to contain any D or

Dtr formulae or terminology. The fact that those verses are sandwiched in many cases by verses which he does consider Deuteronomic (i.e. Dt 7:2, 4, 6) leads me to assume that he felt them to be intrusions or borrowed from some other source.[41] In this case it must be from Ex 34 that Dt and later Dtr took the command to destroy the foreign cult objects.

The order to destroy foreign or Canaanite cult sites and objects is found in Torah in Ex 34, Dt 7 and Dt 12. The three pericopes are similar in content and vocabulary. *'šrym*, *mzbḥ* and *mṣbh* are, in each section the objects to be spoiled upon Israel's entry into and possession of the land. Ex 34:13 lists only *'šrym*, *mzbh* and *mṣbh*, while Dt 7 and and 12 add *pśl*. Dt 7 also adds the injunction to put the inhabitants of the land to the ban, *ḥrm*. Dt 12 appears most corrupt and derivative of Dt 7 and Ex 34. It is important to establish these points of reference since the records of the reforms of Asa, Hezekiah and Josiah employ identical vocabulary. We will determine that the *'šrym* of the destruction formula is a unique usage derived from Ex 34:13. In this earliest context the *'šrym* may well indicate a cult site or installation.

Vocabulary of the Formula

The command and procedure for carrying out the destruction of foreign cult objects in Dt, Dtr and later books of the *OT* is stable. Stability, as stated above, rests on high frequency of words repeated in similar context. *ntṣ* is used with only one exception (2 Ch 14:3) to describe the demolition of an altar. *šbr* is always found with *mṣbwt*. The verbs used with *'šrym* are less stable but fall into two groups:

1. krt, probably deriving from Ex 34:13 and, 2. gd^c from Dt 7:5. When a fourth member is added to the list it is, in the earlier books (Dt) pśl. In the later Dtr books it is usually bmh, which may also take the place of a missing mzbḥ. bmh is construed with either śwr (in H-stem) or ntṣ. Other nouns are added to the list, particularly in 2 Chronicles.

In Exodus and Deuteronomy all three members are present, mzbh, mṣbh, and 'šrym. Two passages add a fourth to the list. In only two other cases (2 Ch 31:1 and 14:3) do we find all three listed together in the same verse. In other entries (2 Ki 23:6ff; Ju 6:25ff; 2 Ch 34:4ff) the complete listing is made in several verses. The fact that, for instance, in 2 Ki 23:6ff, the members of the list are separated by modifiers and narrative does not mask the underlying formula. If all repetitions and descriptions of the altars and who built them were removed, we would find our basic formula intact.

There are also incomplete lists with only two members of the basic list represented. From the choice of nouns and verbs used it is clear that they are derived from the longer list. The expression has been modified to a great extent but remains a recognizable descendant of one of the original injunctions.

The verbs associated with the nouns mzbḥ and mṣbh in our formula are ntṣ and šbr respectively. They are stable in Ex 34, Dt, Dtr and Chr. ntṣ is found in P in Lev 11:35 and 14:45. In each instance the contaminated object is to be destroyed or broken into pieces. The house (Lev 14) and the clay vessel (Lev 11) through the action of destruction are removed from use. In Ex 34, Dt 7 and 12 (the only cases of ntṣ in Ex and Dt) ntṣ applies solely to the destruction of the mzbḥ.

The altar in these cases is unfit for use because of its dedication to "another god." In Dtr, Ju 2:2 and 6:25ff nts is also associated with mzbḥ. Gideon brings down a tower in Ju 8, and in Ju 9:45 Abimelech tears down the city (presumably its walls). Both use ntṣ. 2 Kings employs ntṣ to describe the destruction of cult objects: house of Baal, bmh, altar and houses of the qdšym, and the walls of Jerusalem (25:10). In Jeremiah (33:4; 39:8; 52:14) its meaning is more generalized and includes the destruction of any structure.

The range of meaning and use of ntṣ in P, JE and D is confined to the destruction of either an altar (JE and D) or an object contaminated and no longer considered clean (P). In two pericopes in the book of Judges (chapters 2 and 6) nts is construed with altar and with 'šrwt/h. The verb to cut down the 'šrym, krt, is the same as is found in Ex 34.

The use of nts to tear down altars of foreign gods or altars contaminated by false worship remains in the later works. We find it in 2 Ki 23:12ff; 2 Ch31:1; 34:4,7. In other cases in which the altar is either not mentioned or given along with the bmh or the bmh is substituted for it the verb śwr (in H-stem) is employed (2 Ki 18:4; 2 Ch 14:2; 17:6). In cases where the altar is mentioned with ntṣ as first member, bmh is added at some other place in the list with a different verb.

gd^{c} is a relatively rare verb in the OT occuring only 22 times. It is most common in the later prophets especially Jeremiah and Zechariah. In the Pentateuch it is found only two times: Dt 7:5 and 12:3. Other instances are Ju 21:6 (not related to our formula) and 2 Ch 14:2 and 31:1. We would expect, if P or JE were late, or after D, to find gd^{c} at least in positions which are related to D or derived from it as 2

Ch 31:1 and 14:2 which clearly have intentions similar to Ex 34. 2 Ch and Dt use *gd*^{c} in the D-stem while Judges, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Amos use N-stem. The other four cases use G-stem.[42]

The Canaanite cult of the *bmh*, according to *OT* cultic prohibitions, required altar, pillars (or stelae, *mṣbwt*) and *'šrym*. Langlamet[43] asks the question: Was the law of Ex 34 directed against the cult of the *bmh*? It is certainly not until Asa's reform recorded in 1 Ki 14:14, that putting aside or out of use of the *bmh* is even suggested, though Judah is chastized under Rehoboam for building *bmwt*, *mṣbwt* and *'šrym* (1 Ki 14:23). Judah's sin may not be taken seriously as it serves as an introduction to Shishak's invasion and a conclusion to Rehoboam's reign. Apparently the altars were acceptable as long as they were devoted to Yahweh.[44] It was not until the first major reform under Hezekiah (2 Ki 18:4) that the *bmwt* were put out of use. The *bmwt* were not destroyed they were put away or out of use while the *mṣbwt* and the *'šrym* were destroyed. Was Yahweh worshipped on *bmwt* and was this acceptable, or as Grintz suggests, was this purely a Southern phenomenon?[45]

The context of Lev 26:30 (P) is a curse which begins with verse 14. If Israel makes idols or erects pillars or a *mśkyt* or if she breaks the Sabbaths or the laws of sabbatical release the Lord will destroy "your *bmwt* and cut down your incense altars."[46] Lev does not say directly that *bmwt* are illegal for the worship of the Lord. Nu 33:52 also P, commands Israel to lay waste to the inhabitants' *mskyt* and *slmy mśkh* and to destroy all the *bmwt*. Israel is required to destroy the *bmwt* of the Canaanites. Is there an implied prohibition against Israel building or using a *bmh*?

D never mentions a bmh by name but it is conscious of illegal cult spots on hills. It is common in Dt and Dtr anti-idolatry polemics to condemn worship on hrym (Dt 12:2) and to mock idols made of wood and stone (4:28; 28:36, 64). The 'šrh is never mentioned in these lists. Weinfeld[47] states that Dt uses language in its condemnations very similar to Hosea (4:13//Dt 12:2). Hosea, though, speaks of bmwt (10:8) where Dt never mentions them by name. It is also not even entirely clear that Hosea really refers to the Dtr type of bmh. Did D, in order to avoid anachronisms, not mention concrete names and objects (Jerusalem, the Temple, David, bmwt, Baal) as Weinfeld[48] suggests or did these objects no longer exist? It is hard to believe that bmh could be considered anachronistic. They were a fact from earliest times and not particularly Israelite.[49] If D could mention mṣbh, 'šrym and mzbḥ he could also mention bmh. As there was no precedent for the command to destroy the bmwt D does not advocate tearing them down--at least not by name. Rather Dt orders the Israelites to destroy those sacred places where the Canaanites worshipped their gods: on the hills, hillocks and under trees (Dt 12:2). The parallel texts Ex 34 and Dt 7 never mention hills or places of cult, only the objects, unless we can prove 'šrym were just those sanctuaries.

Exodus and Deuteronomy mention 'šrym, mzbḥ and mṣbh as the objects of Canaanite worship to be destroyed. Dt adds pśl to the list established by Exodus. In later texts, those of Kings and Chronicles, which contain the above three nouns also frequently add bmh to the list, often replacing the altar, mzbḥ. We must then ask why it does not appear in Ex and Dt. Was bmh understood to be the Canaanite cult place and therefore unmentionable? Was it acceptable to Yahweh worship until centralization of the cult (and this implies an earlier date for the Ex and Dt pericopes bearing the formula), or is there embedded in the early formulaic expressions to nullify foreign cult places a word for those installations?

Position of JEPD

Langlamet[50] places the origins of J and E at the time when the worship of Yahweh was in its infancy. At that time worship could take place anywhere but only with the prescribed equipment. One can expect to find such a situation in the time between the settlement and the monarchy. With an impetus towards centralization and control during the period of the kings we also expect more reference to cult spots both legitimate and illegal. The historical books reflect just that situation. Langlamet[51] places Ex 34:13 in the pre- or early monarchal period and ascribes it to a J tradition though not necessarily to strand J.

By comparing the vocabulary describing the foreign cult in P with that of Dt and Dtr we may be able to explain or define the limits of D's cult vocabulary.

'lyl	Lev, Jer, Ezek, Isaiah, Ps, Hab and 1 Chr
ḥmn	Lev, Isaiah, Ezek, 2 Chr
bmh	(as cult site) Lev, Nu, Dtr, Isaiah, Ezek, Jer
glwl	Lev, Dt(once), Dtr, Ezek, Jer
'šrym	Ex, Dt, Dtr, Isaiah, Jer, 2 Chr
mṣkyt	Nu, Ezek, Ps, Prvs

mṣbh	Lev, Ex(E), Dt, Gen, Hos, Isaiah, Dtr, Ezek, Jer
pśl	Lev(once), Ex, Dt, Dtr, Isaiah, Jer, 2 Chr

In P, then, foreign cult objects are: *'lyl*, *hmn*, *mskyt*, *mṣbh*, *glwl*, *pśl*, *bmh*, *ṣlmy mskyt*. D's list contains: *glwl*, *pśl*, *mṣbh*, *mśkh*, *'šrym*. Dtr adds *bmh* to the D list. J and E use D's basic list (or *vice versa*) but none of the objects particular to P as: *mskyt*, *ḥmn* or *'lyl*. Ezekiel uses P's list and leaves out D's *'šrym*, while Jeremiah, also similar to P, retains the *'šrym* apparently deriving from D since the phraseology is often distinctly D or Dtr.

Evidently P either wrote before *'šrym* were known and Ezekiel later ignored the Dtr writing in his work, or P and Ezekiel wrote after such objects were gone from the cult. Given that Jeremiah, Michah and Isaiah, and 2 Chr were all aware of *'šrym*, at least in the formulaic expression if not in reality, it is unlikely that a late P and Ezekiel could have been ignorant of them. The omission could have been made only if Ezekiel used an earlier P, prior at least to D's writings which used J and E. The question then arises, why did P not use J and E's list of cult furniture? It is unreasonable to assume a post-exilic P's ignorance of D and Dtr's terminology. P, then, is quite independent of our formula and its terminology in Ex 34 and Dt and Dtr.

The connection between Dt and Josiah's reform is well established.[52] Dt's phraseology, vocabulary and intent influenced the Dtr redactor of the historical books. We have seen with regards to cultic vocabulary, primarily that of foreign cult, Dt and Dtr correspond to the exclusion of P but have a tenuous connection to E and possibly J.

In examining the J and E strands there is little cultic vocabulary.

It is not too surprising if one considers the nature of the passages; they are by and large stories or myths of the ancestors and the wanderings in the Sinai. The stories contain a vocabulary which is neither cultic nor sacred, rather it is a narrative style which may have derived from oral poetic or narrative traditions. The few cult objects which are mentioned are also non-specific. An altar is spoken of several times (Ex 20:21; 32:4 etc.). Pillars, so often the object of Yahwistic fury in D and Dtr, are frequently mentioned and not at all derisively. Molten images are spoken of only in the context of the golden calf (Ex 32:4, 20). *'šrym* are mentioned only once (Ex 34) in all the pericopes assigned to either J or E. In other pericopes in which foreign cult practices are discouraged or proscribed (Nu 25, Ex 20; 23; 32 and Dt 31) the fear is again that the Israelite will be seduced by foreigners who will encourage them to worship their gods or that the Israelites will do as foreigners and make idols to worship. Ex 34:13 seems a bit suspect as an early text (J or E) because it does not tell Israel not to make idols. It tells Israel to destroy all foreign objects. Chapter 34 does follow in the wake of idolatry as told in chapter 32, and establishes a new covenant between Yahweh and Israel.[53] It also recapitulates and expands some of the ideas expressed in Chapter 23 (especially verses 24-33). Living in close proximity with the natives, intermarrying with them, are ideas expressed by J and E. Destruction of the cult sites is also reminiscent of the early strands.

If we compare the vocabulary of Ex 34:11-16 with Nu 25:1-5, the J account of the Baal Peor incident we find it to be virtually identical. No where else do we find such a parallel for the Exodus pericope.

In fact Ex 34:11-16 could be considered the logical outcome and legal statement on the events at Baal Peor. The use of *'šrym* in Ex 34 remains an enigma since it does not appear in any obviously early passages.

Analysis of cultic vocabulary in the four major editorial strands reveals that the *'šrym* belongs to D and derived literature with the one notable exception of Ex 34. There is no recollection of *'šrym* in P and Ezekiel though we would expect its presence if P were a late editorial strand. Ex 34:13ff remains the crux of the problem--is it earlier than Dt 7 and 12 or does it derive from it? If it is earlier, why is it unique in J and E?

Earliest Use of Formula

There are several bits of evidence in favor of Ex 34:13 preceding Dt 7:5 and 12:3. The formulaic expression appears in its most understandable and least corrupt form in Ex 34. We have seen that a great portion of Dt 12:2, 4 and 5 contains D phraseology and terminology. Dt 12:3, of the three considered (Dt 7:5; Ex 34:13) is the most corrupt and clumsily constructed. One can see where portions of the other two texts were glued together. Dt 7:5 bears one inconsistency and problem which is the prime reason for eliminating it as original. The *ḥrm* is distinctly Dt or Dtr and is additional to the idea expressed in Ex 34. Verse 2b, calling for the ban in a context exactly like Ex 34:11-16 which does not require it, is proof that the text has been tampered with. It is unlikely that some later redactor took *ḥrm* out of the text. If Dt had been aware of the infrequent use of the *ḥrm* in earlier texts he would have left it out of 7:2 and harmonized it with Ex 34. We would also expect that if Ex 34 were derived from Dt 7:5 it would have kept the fourth member of the list the *pśl*, and retained the same verb with *'šrym*--*gd^{c}* or *srp* in 12:3 (which may only be inverted word order).

The fact that Ex 34:13 contains the only mention of *'šrym* in the Pentateuch outside of Dt is disturbing. If the pericope is J or E why doesn't *'šrym* appear in other J or E texts? How is it that P is also unaware of it? In the historical texts its earliest appearance is in Ju 6:25 and the next in 1 Ki 14:15 from the reign of Jeroboam. The *'šrym* were known, if we can consider the traditions of Judges to be authentic, from at least as early as c. 1000 B.C. In 1 Ki 14 the people are chastized for making *'šrym*. In subsequent texts, 1 Ki 15 and 1 Ki 18 the *'šrh* seems to be a proper name. After Ahab, with the exception of Manasseh's atrocities, the *'šrym* are mentioned only in the formulaic expressions, either setting up these objects or tearing them down.

It seems reasonable to suggest that though the *'šrym* were not known or recorded in Israel's earliest history (the narratives of Genesis and the wandering in Sinai) it was introduced to them upon entering Canaan. If this is true, then as Langlamet suggested, the pericope Ex 34:13 dates not earlier than the settlement but not later than prior to the Deuteronomic school. It is not a product of the Deuteronomic school but it does, as mentioned above, bear some marks of it.

Historical Perspectives

The reality behind the formulaic expression is the most difficult aspect of the problem. The fact of its absence in the Priestly source and its scarcity in the early strands J and E alongside its repetitious, monotonous voluminous quantity in the Dtr source indicates that there may not have been much substance behind the expression. As stated above on pages 6-9, the 'šrh mentioned so frequently in the Dtr texts really refers to a few known objects set up by a few kings. Alongside the actual removal of said objects by the zealous kings of Judah we hear of all the other 'šrym throughout the countryside that were hacked down, burned or pulverized. The purges were cultic and aimed at cleaning up cult practices. They were also initiated by priests. The one exception might be Jehu but his purge was originally political and his execution of the Baal priests might be seen as an extension of that political movement. The royal political and religious centers were the subjects of the initial attacks and are most explicitly described.

The sins of the kings of Israel and Judah are recorded in Kings and Chronicles. Kings deals with, in each case, a specific 'šrh set up by Ahab, Maacha and Manasseh and the general summation of Israel's and Judah's sins under Rehoboam and Jeroboam. The destruction of those same objects are also recorded in Kings. Chronicles mentions specifics only in Asa's case but uses the plural 'šrym quite lavishly, and in the formulaic expression.

William Reed in 1949 suggested that the 'šrym just may not have existed at all. He rejected the idea by placing much weight on the historicity of the narratives and avoiding the issue of negative evidence. One wonders why the prophets contemporary with the events, Hosea, Isaiah and Jeremiah are so quiet about the topic of the 'šrym. Hezekiah's and Josiah's reforms emphasized the destruction of the cult objects called *'šrym* and *msbwt*. Hosea, whose school or who himself had an apparently great influence on Deuteronomy and who reviles the people and the monarchs for impure worship and multiplying altars and who never minced words is silent about the *'šrym*.

The kings of Israel are accused specifically of the sins of Jeroboam. It is not until the destruction of the Kingdom that we hear of the sin of the *'šrym*. True Ahab erected an *'šrh* but his decisive sin seems to have been the introduction or support of the Baal cult. There is also no necessary connection between the *'šrh* of Ahab and the *'šrym* of Hosheah. We never hear of the destruction of the *'šrh* that Ahab set up in Samaria. Jehu apparently was not interested in it. Judah's kings, up to Hezekiah, are reviled for leaving the *bmwt*. Once, in the Dtr summary of Rehoboam's reign, we hear of the sin of the *'šrym*. One is inclined to believe that these objects or structures were either not so widespread or were wiped out for the most part in Hezekiah's reform. What was left for Josiah were those in Israel and those on Solomon's sacred site. He also cleaned up the Asherah cult left by Manasseh. Why the Dtr and especially the Chronicler took such a fancy to the expression is a question that cannot be answered. The destruction of the foreign cult became the symbol for purity and its expression in the formulaic phrases was applied generously in I and II Kings and II Chronicles.

Several of the pericopes containing the word *'šrh* (sing.) also fit into the destruction formula: Ju 6:25-30; II Ki 18:4 and part of II Ki 23:4-7, (though the most solid application of the formula is found in verse 14f). The remainder of the verses giving *'šrh* are, as mentioned above, specifically related to the practices of those kings charged with the grossest apostasy: Ahab and Manasseh and Queen-mother Maacha. Ahab made an *'šrh* (I Ki 16:33) which was probably set up in Samaria (II Ki 13:6) and related to some aspect of Asherah worship though this is not clear from the text at all and can only be inferred by reference to Jezebel's association with the prophets of the Asherah in I Ki 18:19. It is noteworthy that Manasseh and Maacha made an image for or of the Asherah; in other words, the *'šrh* was not made (^{c}*sh*), the image was. Ahab made an *'šrh*. This item is not qualified by *pśl* or *mplṣt* nor is the *'šrh* which Gideon cut down (Ju 6:25-30). The *'šrh* stood over (though some would read "on") the altar. This is supported by the sequence of the command which required that the altar be torn down first, then the *'šrh*. *LXX* translates the Hebrew ^{c}*l* as *epi*. Thus the *'šrh* of Ahab and Gideon might be considered sanctuaries.

Asa's mother/grandmother, made a *mplṣt* (probably an idol) for Asherah (I Ki 15:13=I Ch 15:16) and Manasseh made an idol of the Asherah II Ki 21:7) which Josiah later removed from the Temple and burned (II Ki 23:4-7). The cleansing of the Temple and removal of the Asherah image should be distinguished from the *'šrym* mentioned later in verse 14. Unfortunately, even though it seems fairly safe at this point to advocate the existence of an Asherah cult in both Israel and Judah during certain periods, we have almost no information describing such a cult or which Asherah was worshipped. The most we can suggest is, in Israel, a Phoenician Asherah was worshipped.

Summary

The remainder of references for the *'šrh/ym* are found in formulae related to the destruction formula of Ex 34 and to its correlate, the prohibition against setting up *'šrym*. Since the *'šrym* are listed with other cult objects and installations and were to be found not in buildings but in the countryside, in the valleys and on hills, there is no reason, in view of comparative Semitic lexicography, not to assume these to have been a type of sanctuary. They may well have been either located in groves or symbolically represented groves by means of wooden poles.[54]

While in other Semitic languages and literatures we find both Asherah the goddess and *'šrh/t* the place or sanctuary, we never find a situation analogous to the one suggested by the critics of the *OT* wherein the *'šrh* and the *'šrym* were poles or trees which were the symbols of the goddess Asherah. The confusion is admittedly inherent in the texts themselves and is amply reflected in the broad use of *alšos* in the *LXX* in places which appear quite inappropriate. The evidence brought forth on the formulaic use of the destruction motif which bears the word *'šrym* and at times *'šrh*, draws out a very possible distinction between two lexical items known from comparative Semitics.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. 'šrh: Dt 16:21~~; I~~ Ki 15:13, 16:33, 18:19; 2 Ki 13:6, 17:16, 18:4, 21:3,7, 23:6,7,15,4; Ju 6:25,26,30,28; 2 Ch 15:16, 33:3.
'šrym: Ex 34:13; Dt 7:5, 12:3; I Ki 14:15,23; 2 Ki 17:23, 23:14; Mi 5:13; Jer 17:2; Is 17:8, 27:9; 2 Ch 14:2, 17:6, 24:18, 31:1, 33:19, 34:3,4,7.
'šrwt: Ju 3:7; 2 Ch 19:3, 33:3.

2. Fort Worth, Texas, 1949.

3. cf. J. M. Grintz, "Some Observations on the 'High-Place' in the History of Israel" in VT 27:1 (1977). 111-113.

4. Infra pp. 73-78.

5. Yamashita, T., The Goddess Asherah, p. 137. Shows development from consort of El to cult object.

6. 2 Ki 23:6ba: wyṣ' 't h'šrh mbyt yhwh mḥwṣ lyrwšlm l nḥl qdrwn wysrp 'th...

7. 2 Ch 33:19; 34:4; Dt 7:5; 12:3.

8. 2 Ki 23:7: wytṣ 't bty hqdšym 'šr bbyt yhwh 'šr hnšym 'rgwt šm btym l'šrh.

9. 2 Ki 23:13; 1 Ki 11:5.

10. 1 Ki 15:13: wgm 't m^{c}kh 'mw wyśrh mgbyrh 'šr ^{c}sth mplṣt l'šrh wykrt 'ś' 't mplṣth wrysrp bnḥl qdrn.

11. The list is not exclusive for there is some overlap with P. However we would expect some of P's list in our formula if either of the two were derived from the other. Dt's general hatred of idolatry and use of several other expressions is in part derived from Hosea. Cf. M. Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School, 366ff.

12. The exceptions and reverse formula will be discussed below.

13. Ex 23:20-23.

14. Langlamet, F., "Israël et 'L'Habitant du Pays'", RB 76 (1969) 332. He seems to equate originality with early composition.

15. op. cit. note 14.

16. Ibid. 334-338.

17. J. M. Miller, "The Fall of the House of Ahab," VT 17 (1967) 307-324.

18. F-E Wilms, "Das Jahwistische Bundesbuch in Exodus 34," Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, Passim.

19. Ibid. 156. Contra Childs, B., Exodus, 608, 611f.

20. Op. cit. 487.

21. Cf. Alexander Rofé, "The Strata of the Law About the Centralization of Worship in Deuteronomy and the History of the Deuteronomic Movement," Supp. VT 22(1972).

22. Langlamet, F., op. cit. 487.

23. Cf. A. Rofé, op. cit. See also J. Milgrom's forthcoming article "Profane Slaughter and a Formulaic Key to the Composition of Deuteronomy" in HUCA, 46(1976) passim.

24. Cited by Wilms, op. cit. 156.

25. In Ex 34, though, znh seems to describe a Canaanite religious practice which Israel found repulsive. In other texts, it is used derogatorily to describe Israel's behavior vis à vis foreign gods. Israel's actions could be seen as imitating that of the Canaanites.

26. Langlamet, op. cit. 498.

27. Gen 15:21 and 10:16.

28. The Dtr list of Ju 3:10 repeats 7:1 in a slightly altered order.

29. Georg Fohrer, Introduction to the OT, 160ff.

30. M. Weinfeld, op. cit., 166f.

31. J. Milgrom, op. cit., passim. "The Exodus Laws from which the Deuteronomist spins his Midrash are attributed to E." re: Ex 22 and 23:12 and Dt 7:5, 25-26. Cf. his notes on Ex 23:20-33, passim. Milgrom notes the similarity between Ex 23:20-33 and D references to the conquest. He uses a similar argument I apply to ḥrm in Dt 7 and its absence in Ex 34. "Surely if Exod 23:20-33 were reworked by a Deuteronomist, would he have abstained from expunging the angel from the text? Secondly, as noted the notion of ḥerem is peculiar to D. Again, how could a deuteronomic editor have remained content with an edict of expulsion? Would he not perforce have interpolated the specific ḥerem instructions to destroy the inhabitants, burn their gods, and ban their sancta (cf. Deut 7:24-26; 20:16-17)? Thus the allegation of deuteronomic interpolation in Ex 23:20-33 must be denied and the correspondencies between the two sources can only be one-directional: D borrowing from E."

32. Cf. Dt 20:16.

33. The laws prior to Dt call for expulsion (Ex 23, 33; 34; Nu 33) not slaughter. Cf. note 31, infra. p. 36.

34. Weinfeld, op. cit. n. 39. Typically D speaks of objects of wood and stone, objects made by man which could, at least in part be destroyed by fire.

35. Ibid. 322, no. 15.

36. Ibid. 324, no. 1.

37. Cf. *infra*. note 34.

38. 2 Ki 23:6 lists the two pair together but also gives the normal situation in verses 12-15.

39. Verse 3b could then be assumed to have originally followed v. 2.

40. Langlamet, op. cit. 484f.

41. "You feel correctly that I do not find in Ex 34 any deuteronomic phrase and that Deut 7:5 and 12:3 are dependent on Ex 34." Private correspondance 7/75.

42. Note that Gideon of Ju 6-8 is formed from the root *gd*^{c}. Is he the chopper?

43. Op. cit. 486f.

44. J. M. Grintz, "Some Observations of the 'High-Place' in the History of Israel," *VT* 27:1 (1977), 111-113. Grintz presents an interesting suggestion for *bmh* which would explain the absence in Ex 34 and Dt. If *bmh* were Southern or Moabite as he suggests, the North would have had little actual experience of them.

45. Grintz, op. cit., passim. Contra Yamashita, *Goddess Asherah*, p. 113ff.

46. It is difficult to know if P considered the *bamot* illegal for Israel and a cause of the Lord's wrath or if he will destroy them in the course of wiping Israel from the land. Lev 26:1ff (esp. 30-32) gives a law not to build or worship images. One of the consequences of disobedience will be the destruction of the places and means of worship. Does this mean Yahweh will reject further worship (30f) or that these are a cause of anger? Kaufmann, *Religion of Israel*, 176, says that P fails to ban *bamot*. P does ban sacrifices in the fields to the advantage of altars (and presumably *bamot*). See also his development of sacrificial law p. 182ff.

47. Weinfeld, op. cit. 366f.

UMI

48, Ibid., 6-7.

49. Cf. Grintz, op. cit., passim.

50. Op. cit., 506f. I cite Langlamet only as representative of the majority of scholars who agree, on the whole, with his dating of J and E. I suspect he dates them a bit on the early side but relative to D and P he is probably correct.

51. Op. cit. 505f.

52. See for example G. Fohrer, Introduction..., 168.

53. Brevard Childs, Exodus. passim.

54. Cf. below Chapter Two, pp. 73-78.

Chapter II

AṮIRAT AT UGARIT

The Ugaritic Baal cycle of mythological epics contains the most instructive materials concerning Aṯirat. They are also most confusing in terms of unity and sequence of materials. What is the proper order of the texts, and do all of them together form an integrated cycle or story, or should we see groups of texts as redactions reflecting local religious traditions or separate cycles?[1] It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss or offer solutions to these problems but of course this study will reflect a bias.

Aṯirat plays her most active roles in UT 51(=CTA 4) wherein she champions Baal's cause, and UT 49 (=CTA 6) in which she nominates ᶜAṯtar to replace the fallen Baal. Her children become the object of Baal's wrath in the latter text. In the *ᶜnt* text (=CTA 3) Anat takes over, with a somewhat different tack, the role Aṯirat played in UT 51. Aṯirat's children are held up as examples of the privilege which Baal was denied, but which were apparently due him. In these texts a few things are clear. Aṯirat is not the mother of Baal and Anat (they may have been, however, children of El) yet they are the younger generation who must appeal to the elders. Aṯirat has a considerable voice in determining who will be king of the gods and, as chief goddess and wife of El, this is a natural position for her to have. Aṯirat seems to have no real loyalties to the younger generation; she neither weeps nor moans when *ym* and *mt* are vanquished by Baal, though her alarm in UT 51:II may reflect that dismay (compare to Anat's mourning over Baal). However she does appear associated with the sea, *ym*, with El who lives at the source of the rivers, with one of her servants *dgy*, the fisherman. She is at times Lady Aṯirat-of-the-Sea and Aṯirat of Tyre (and perhaps Sidon).

In the following pages I will comment on and translate those texts in which Aṯirat plays a major role. Her epithets, servants and her role in the Ugaritic pantheon and religion will be discussed separately following the texts.

UT 51 (=CTA 4)

col i

line 1(?)-19 are reconstructed as repetition of ^{c}nt 2*-6 cf. the notes for that section.

20 ap . mṯn . rgmm

21 argmk . šskn m^{c}

22 mgn . rbt . aṯrt ym

23 mġẓ . qnyt . ilm

translation

20 Also another matter

21 I will tell you: Present now

22 a gift offering of Lady Aṯirat of the Sea

23 a present of beseeching of the Creatress of the gods.

notes and comments:

There are several important problems connected with this text and its translation. We do not know who is speaking these and the preceding lines. Ginsberg[2] makes Baal the speaker as does Cassuto[3] through the messengers *gpn w ugr*. However, Cassuto sees the message as a statement of confirmation on Aṯirat's part. It is her wish that the project be undertaken and *ḥyn* is to go to the forge at her behest. The text which follows seems to contradict this understanding of the action.

20. *mṯn rgmm* after Gordon in UT glossary 2705.
21. *šskn m^{c}*. Translation is difficult. Gordon[4] translates, "Go to!" Ginsberg[5] reads,"Just try doing..." and Aistleitner,[6] "lasse herstellen." Heb. *skn* in G, "to care for, be of use," in H with *^{c}m*, "to acquaint oneself with." The meaning is not clear unless we somehow associate it with *škn*, "to place or put." This involves linguistic problems. *m^{c}* is good indication that we have an imperative.[7]
22. *mgn* is translated by Deitrich, Loretz and Sanmartin[8] as "gift" or "present," by Aistleitner[9] as, "Geschenke." Cassuto [10] reads, "wish or request," or "desire," "...and thou occupy thyself with the desire of Lady Asherah of the Sea, with the wish of the progenitress of the gods."
23. *mġẓ* is a familiar parallel of *mgn* and may be synonymous. The verb *ġẓy* is also found with the verb *mgn*.[11]

In general, I agree with Aistleitner's translation of the section quoted here. The subsequent columns will support that preference. The identification of the speaker is another problem, but again, in view of column ii it seems probable that the speaker is not Baal, who is the one who does the gift giving, but El or some other adviser. If Baal or Anat had just presented a petition to El it is reasonable that he would advise Baal of the most expedient means to secure his palace.

UT 51 (=CTA 4)

col ii

2. labn[

3. aḫdt . plkh [. bydh]

4. plk . (t^{c}/q)lt . bymnh

5. npynh . mks . bšrh

6. tmt^{c} . mdh . bym . ṯn

7. npynh . bnhrm

8. štt . ḫptr . lišt

9. ḫbrṯ . lẓr . pḥmm

10. t^{c}pp . ṯr . il . dpid

11. tġẓy . bny . bnwt

12. bnši . ^{c}nh . wtphn

13. hlk . b^{c}l . aṯ(t)rt

14. kt^{c}n . hlk . btlt

15. ^{c}nt [.] tdrq . ybmt

16. [limm] . bh . p^{c}nm

17. [tṭṭ . b^{c}] dn . ksl

18. [tṯbr . ^{c}ln . p] nh! id[c]

19. tġṣ [. pnt . ks] lh

20. anš . dt . ẓr[h]

21. tšu . gh . wtṣḥ [. i]k

22. mġy . aliyn [. b]^{c}l

23. ik . mġyt . b[t]lt

24. ^{c}nt . mḫṣy hm [. m]ḫṣ

25. bny . hm [. mkly . ṣ]brt

26. aryy [. ẓl] . ksp . [a]ṯrt

27. kt^{c}n . ẓl . ksp . wn [-]t

28. ḫrṣ . šmḫ . rbt . a[ṯrt]

29. ym . gm . lġlmh . k[tṣḥ]

30. ^{c}n. mkṯr . ap t[---]

31. dgy . rbt . aṯr [t . ym]

32. qḥ . rṯt . bdk t[ ]

33. rbt . ^{c}l . ydm [

34. bmdd . il . y[m

35. bym . (?) il . d[

36. hr . il . y[

UT 51 col ii

Lines 1-11 are virtually unintelligible see notes below.

12. Upon lifting her eyes she sees;

13. the going of Baal, Aṯirat beholds

14. the going of Maiden

15. Anat, the tramping of ybmt

16. [limm.] Under (her) feet

17. [do stumble; be]hind, her back

18. [cracks; above, her f]ace

19. sweats; [the corners (sides) of her b]ack

20. tremble; the muscles of her back weaken.

21. She lifts her voice and cries

22. "Why has Aliyan Baal come?

23. Wherefore comes the Maiden

24. Anat? To slay me or slay

25. my sons or [to destroy the c]lan
26. of my kin?" The shimmer of silver Aṯirat
27. sees, the shimmer of silver and [the ---
28. of gold. Happy is Lady A[ṯirat
29. of the Sea. Aloud to her lad she [cries:
30. "See the skill! Now [---
31. O fisherman of Lady Aṯira[t of the Sea]
32. Take a net in your hand [put?]
33. a big one over your two hands [
34. into the beloved of El, Y[am?]
35. into the sea of El [na- ?
36. haru] the god of [---

UT 51 notes

Lines 1-11 contain vocabulary which makes translation almost impossible. The variety of translations illustrates the difficulty.[12] We also do not know who the protagonist is. Some suggest that Anat is pleading with El for Baal's house.[13] Others assume it to be Aṯirat who is washing her clothes in the sea at the onset of calm weather.[14] Cassuto[15] believes the goddess is one of Mot's allies who is attacking *Hyn* to prevent the construction of the palace.

12-24. Aṯirat sees Baal and Anat approach. The language parallels that of *ᶜnt* III:29-32, where Anat fears an adversary has risen against Baal. Aṯirat's fears are stated in lines 24-25.

24-25. Translations differ in this section also. De Moor,[16] "(Did you come) to slay me or to slay my sons or to annihilate the band of my kin?" (Baal has just killed *ym* in UT 68).

Aistleitner:[17] "Warum ist Aliyan Baal gekommen Warum ist gekommen die Jungfrau Anat? Sie mordeten hin meine Kinder, Sie erschlugen eine Schar meine Sippe!" Gordon:[18] "Why has Aliyn Baal come? Why came the Virgin Anat? Is it that my smiters or the smiters of my sons [ ] the band of my kin [ ]?"

The question is, does Aṯirat fear for herself and her children or does she recall some past act of Anat and Baal that might be related in *ᶜnt* or UT 68? I believe she fears an immediate threat which is dispelled (line 28f) with the presentation of the gift.

26-36. Aṯirat sees the gift made for her by *kṯr w ḫss* in col. i. Her fears allayed and she rejoices and orders her servant, *dgy*, to toss nets into the sea.

30. *ᶜn mkṯr*: the crux of this phrase is the word *mkṯr*.

de Moor:[19] "Look I shall open up the *place of abundance*"

She will treat her guests to a fish fry.

Gordon:[20] "I shall entice the eye of the Skilled One"

Ginsberg:[21] "Look thou, deft one." Does this refer to *kṯr w ḫss*? Although we have never seen *m-* "from " in Ugaritic is it possible that she is saying "Look, from Koṯar!"

21-33. The lines are fragmentary. de Moor fills in some of the missing words at the end of 32 *qdš*, and *amrr* at the end of 33.

The question remains, why she was ordering nets tossed into the sea. If she were afraid for herself she would not be snaring *ym* at the sight of a gift.[22] Is she offering food for a feast?[23] While we know nets were used to bag enemies and monsters[24] there is no indication Yam was a foe of Aṯirat's.

UT 51 (=CTA 4)

col iii

23. aḫr . mġy . aliyn . b^{c}l
24. mġyt . btlt . ^{c}nt
25. tmgnn . rbt . [.a] ṯrt ym
26. tġẓyn . qnyt ilm
27. wt^{c}n . rbt . aṯrt ym
28. ik . tmgnn . rbt
29. aṯrt . ym . tġẓyn
30. qnyt . ilm . mgntm
31. ṯr . il . dpid . hm . ġẓtum
32. bny bnwt wt^{c}n
33. btlt . ^{c}nt . nmgn
34. [-]m . rbt . aṯrt . ym
35. [nġ]ẓ . qnyt . ilm
36. [---]. nmgn . hwt
37. [--]. aliyn . b^{c}l
38. [--]rbt . aṯrt . ym
39. [---]btlt . ^{c}nt
40. [--tl] ḥm . tšty
41. [ilm . wtp] q . mrġṯm
42. [ṯd . bḥrb . m] lḥt . qṣ
43. [mri . tšty . k] rpnm yn
44. [wbks . ḫrṣ . dm] . ^{c}ṣm

UT 51 col. iii

23. After Aliyan Baal arrived
24. (after) the arrival of Maiden Anat
25. They entreat Lady Aṯirat of the Sea
26. They beseech the Creatress of the Gods.
27. Then replies Lady Aṯirat of the Sea:
28. Why do you entreat Lady
29. Aṯirat of the Sea, beseech
30. The Creatress of the Gods? Did you entreat
31. The Bull, El-Benign, or beseech
32. the Begettor of Beings?" Then answered
33. Maiden Anat, "We entreat
34. Lady Aṯirat of the Sea
35. beseech the Creatress of Gods.
36. [thereafter?] we will entreat him."
37. [ ] Alyian Baal
38. [ ] Lady Aṯirat of the Sea
39. [ ] Maiden Anat
40. [They a]te, the [gods]
41. drank. [And they were sup]plied with a suckling
42. of the teat,] [with a salted knife they c]ut a fatling to pieces
43. [They drank beak]ers of wine
44. [In the cups of gold the blood] of trees.

Notes:

After Baal's list of insults (1-22) he and Anat appear before Aṯirat to plead their case. Apparently in col. ii Aṯirat only sees them but does not greet or talk with them.

23-35 repeats col I:20-23, they are to curry Aṯirat's favor. Apparently El was not the one who suggested the plan, he will be petitioned after Aṯirat.

40-44 The lines are broken. Reconstruction is based on *CTA* p. 25. I follow de Moor's translation in *AOAT* 16, 146. Aṯirat has invited Baal and Anat to share the feast with the gods *mrġtm td*. M. Pope[25] writes that it is a collective title of the gods, they are "those who suck." The word is not dual.[26] De Moor[27] compares the section to *ᶜnt* I:6-8 and argues that *mri* is parallel to *mġrtm* not *ilm* with *mġrt*, without enclitic *-m*, can be either singular or plural.

UT 51 (=CTA 4)

cols. iv-v

1. ṯr[il . ab- . wtᶜn . rbt]

2. aṯr[t . ym . šmᶜ . lqdš]

3. wam[rr . l(?)dgy . rbt]

4. aṯrt . ym [. mdl . ᶜr]

5. ṣmd . pḥl . [št . gpny . dt]

6. ksp . dt . yr[q . nqbny]

7. ᶜdb . gpn . atnt[k]

8. yšmᶜ . qdš . wamr[r]

9. mdl . ᶜr . ṣmd . pḥl

10. št . gpnm . dt . ksp

11. dt . yrq . nqbnm

12. ᶜdb . gpn . atnth

13. yḥbq . qdš . wamrr

14. yštn . aṯrt . lbmt . ^{c}r

15. lysmsmt . bmt . pḥl

16. qdš . yuḫdm . šb^{c}r

17. amrr . kkbkb . lpnm

18. aṯr . btlt . ^{c}nt

19. wb^{c}l . tb^c . mrym . ṣpn

20. idk . lttn . pnm

21. ^{c}m . il . mbk . nhrm

22. qrb . apq . thmtm

23. tgly . ḏd . il . wtbu

24. qrš . mlk . ab . šnm

25. lp^{c}n . il . thbr . wtql

26. tštḫwy . wtkbdh

27. hlm . il . kyphnh

28. yprq . lṣb . wyṣḥq

29. p^{c}nh . lhdm . yṯpd . wykrkr

30. uṣb^{c}th . yšu . gh . wy[ṣḥ]

31. ik . mġyt . rbt . aṯr[t . y]m

32. ik . atwt . qnyt . i [lm].

33. rġb . rġbt . wtġt [??]

34. hm . ġmu . ġmit . w^{c}s [-?]

35. lḥm . hm . štym . lḥ[m]

36. bṯlḥnt . lḥm št

37. bkrpnm . yn . bk⟨s⟩ . ḫrṣ

38. dm . ^{c}ṣm . hm . yd . il mlk

39. yḫssk . ahbt . t̠r . t^{c}rrk

40. wt^{c}n . rbt . at̠rt ym

41. tḥmk . il . ḥkm . ḥkmt

42. ^{c}m ^{c}lm . ḥyt . ḥẓt

43. tḥmk . mlkn . aliy[n .] b^{c}l

44. t̠pṭn . win . d^{c}lnh

45. klnyn . q[š]h [.] n[bln]

46. klnyn [.n]bl . ksh

47. [an]y [.] lyṣḥ . t̠r il . abh

48. [i]l . mlk . dyknnh . yṣḥ

49. at̠rt . wbnh . ilt . wṣbrt

50. aryh . wn . in . bt . lb^{c}l

51. km . ilm . wḥẓr . kbn . at̠rt

52. mt̠b il . mẓll . bnh

53. mt̠b rbt . at̠rt . ym

54. mt̠b klt [.] knyt

55. mt̠b . pdry . bt ar

56. mẓll . ṭly [.] bt rb

57. mt̠b . arṣ⟨y⟩ . bt y^{c}bdr

58. wy^{c}n lṭpn il dpid

59. p^{c}bd . an . ^{c}nn . at̠rt

60. p^{c}bd . ank . aḫd . ult̠

61. hm . amt . at̠rt . tlbn

62. lbnt . ybn . bt . lb^{c}l

col. v

63. km ilm . wḥẓr. kbn . at̠rt

64. wt^{c}n . rbt. aṯrt ym

65. rbt . ilm . lḥkmt

66. šbt . dqnk . ltsrk

67. rḫntt . d[-]. lirtk

68. wn ap .^{c}dn . mṭrh

69. b^{c}l . y^{c}dn . ^{c}dn . ṯkt . bglṯ

70. w⟨y⟩tn . qlh . b^{c}rpt

71. šrh . larṣ . brqm

72. bt . arzm . ykllnh

73. hm . bt . lbnt . y^{c}msnh

74. lyrgm . laliyn b^{c}l

UT 51 translation and notes col iv and v, the first line is only partially translatable

1. Lady Aṯirat answers
2. "Attention! O Qdš
3. w ammr, Fisherman of Lady
4. Aṯirat of the Sea. Saddle a donkey
5. harness an ass. Put on my saddle, the saddle
6. of silver and my trappings, the trappings of gold
7. arrange the saddles of the she-asses!"
8. qdš w amrr obeys.
9. He saddles the donkey, harnesses the ass.
10. He put on the saddle of silver
11. and the trappings of gold,
12. he arranges the saddles of his she-asses.
13. qdš w ammr grasps Aṯirat

14. he places At̲irat on the donkey's back,
15. on the lovely back of the ass.
16. *Qdš* proceeds to lead,
17. *Amrr* like a star in front,
18. After is the Maiden Anat.
19. Baal leaves for the heights of Ṣapanu.
20. Then she sets face
21. towards El at the sources of the Two-Rivers
22. in the midst of the pools of the Two-Deeps.
23. They entered the tent of El and went into
24. the tent shrine of the King, Father of Years.
25. At El's feet she bows and falls down
26. she prostrates and does him honor.
27. As soon as El sees her
28. he opens his mouth and laughs,
29. his feet on the footstool he puts and he twiddles
30. his thumbs. He lifts up his voice and cries:
31. "Why comes Lady At̲irat of the Sea?
32. Why approaches the Creatress of the gods?
33. Are you hungry and [?
34. Are you thirsty and [?
35. Bread or Wine? Eat!
36. from the tables bread. Drink
37. from the flagon wine, from the gold goblet
38. Blood of grapes. Or does the affection of El the king
39. stir you; the love of the Bull arouse you?
40. Then Lady At̲irat of the Sea answered,
41. "Your decree, El, is wise,

42. "Wisdom and eternal life is your portion
43. Your decree is: Our king is Aliyan Baal
44. Our sovereign and there is no other.
45. We all carry his gift (?)
46. All of us bear his cup.
47. But he cries to Bull El his father,
48. El the King his begetter,
49. Aṯirat and her sons, Elat and the band
50. of her kin: "Look, no house has Baal like the gods
51. nor court like the sons of Aṯirat,
52. the house of El is the shelter of his son,
53. the house of Lady Aṯirat of the Sea
54. is the house of the perfect brides,
55. the house of *pdry* the daughter of *ar*
56. the shelter of *tly* the daughter of *rb*
57. the house of *arṣy* the daughter of *y^cbdr*"
58. Then answered the Kindly One, El Benign:
59. "Now I am a slave, I serve the *^{c}nn*
60. Now I am a servant, I hold the *ult*
61. If Aṯirat is a maid, let her mould bricks.
62. A house will be built for Baal
63. like the gods, and a court like the sons of Aṯirat."
64. Then replied Lady Aṯirat of the Sea:
65. "Great, El, and Wise
66. Your beard's grey instructs you
67. --- to your breast.

68. Now, too, the seasons of his rain
69. Baal will appoint, the season of *tkt* in snow.
70. And he will give forth his voice in the clouds,
71. His lightening flashing to earth.
72. A house of cedars let him complete it
73. A house of brick let him pile up.
74. Let it be told to Baal... "

By most standards of translation UT 51 cols. iv and v are quite understandable. Col. iv opens with Aṯirat's orders to *qdš w amrr* to harness beasts for the trip to El's residence. Some of the technical vocabulary is obscure but context supplies sufficient definition for our purposes.[28] Aṯirat and her entourage leave with *qdš* heading out first, *amrr* like a star and Anat following; Baal returns home.[29]

23. I prefer Clifford's[30] suggestion that *dd* is a tent to Ginsberg's[31] "field and pavilion." Clifford translates the two words *dd* and *qrš* "tent and tent-shrine."[32] *gly* in Heb. is to roll back as perhaps the rolling back of a tent flap. In this case he translates *gly* "to enter."[33]

El asks why Aṯirat would come to him. He offers her food and drink, perhaps to refresh herself after the trip. Finally in line 38 he offers affection or does he ask the question, "have you come to me because you love me?"

She then states the purpose of her visit. Baal has been appointed by El (lines 42ff) as king of the gods.

41-43. We could read with Clifford,[34]

Thy decree, O El is wise
Thy wisdom lasts forever
A life of good fortune is thy command
Our king is Alyian Baal

Is the t̲h̲m the order that made Baal king or is it a hypostasis of El's authority and distinct from him? In this context it seems wise to view the t̲h̲m as the edict which made Baal king. At̲irat put before El the proposition that he appoint Baal (probably as he did Yam in UT 129) to be king over the gods. The gods serve Baal as they did Yam in UT 137:I. Now he needs a house for his wives.

45-46. I follow Ginsberg's translation.[35] Cassuto[36] translates,

> "O our klny, we bring his beaker, O our klny - we bring his cup." The gods bring the cup to receive Baal's portion from El. Gordon translates the lines,[37] "Let us Both drain his chalice, Both of us drain his cup."

The cup certainly has some reference to kingship[38] as we have observed in ᶜnt:10ff (= CTA 3). Perhaps At̲irat is making the point that though the other gods serve Baal, he has no house of his own.

UT 51 columns IV:58 - V:1 is El's reply to At̲irat which follows her request of El that Baal be allowed to build a house. The translations of this section vary considerably.

Ginsberg[39] translates the lines,

"Am I a slave, an attendant of Asherah?
Am I a slave to handle...?
Or is Asherah a handmaid to make bricks?
Let a house..."

Albright's translation[40] reads,

"Not a slave am I, A play-boy of Athirat
Not a slave am I, an apprentice carpenter

If Maid Athirat will mould bricks
A house will be built for Baal."

Albright[41] cites an article by H. Hamburger. A cache of coins found at Gush Halav contained a coin on which is shown Dido supervising the building of Carthage.[42] One of the workers is a bricklayer. The coin was minted in Tyre and the inscription reads ΔΙ ΔΩ אלת [צו·ר] . The word "Tyre" was reconstructed from a similar coin (no. 137) which bears an identical inscription. Are we sure that Asherah was the goddess of Tyre in 238 A.D.? Albright[43] wrote, the "Chief goddess of Tyre, Asherah... was identified in Graeco-Roman times with Dido, the founder of Carthage... it may be added that Asherah appears as a brick maker for the house of Baal." The suggestion is intriguing but hardly substantial. I believe El's comment is somewhat ironic, he is a carpenter and Aṯirat a brick layer.[44]

Obermann[45] interprets the text as showing some animosity between El and Aṯirat who endorses Baal's ascendance. El yields grudgingly to Aṯirat's request and adds that a handmaid of Aṯirat could be assigned the task.

As Dr. van Zijl outlined,[46] the passage has led to numerous translations. De Moor's[47] partial translation leads to some possibilities. He translates: "Of course I am a slave..., of course I am a slave..., if Aṯiratu is a hand-maid." The p̱-introduces the protasis, *hm* the conditional or concessive apodisis. An *^{c}bd* is compared to an *amt*, and the speaker, El, is *an* and *ank* in parallel construction with Aṯirat. If Aṯirat will build bricks *tlbn lbnt* we should expect *^{c}nn* *aṯrt* and *aḫd* *ulṯ* to be combinations of subjects and predicates also. We could read *aṯrt* as a verb from *ṯrt*, Heb. *šrt*, to serve[48] "I will serve." *aḫd*, to hold *aḫd*, "I will hold." El is saying,"I am a slave and will serve the *ᶜnn,* a slave and I will hold the *ult*, Aṯirat is a maid and will mould bricks." The *ᶜnn* and *ult* may have to do with carpentry as Albright suggested[49] if in lines 72-73 the trees and bricks refer to El's and Aṯirat's earlier efforts.

The problem with these few lines is that we really do not know the tone of El's reply. Given his jovial reception of the goddess and his positive response to Aṯirat's request we should assume the tone was amiable.

In the following section Aṯirat praises El's wisdom and lists the good things Baal will do in appointing the seasons. There is reference again to carpentry and masonry (72-73) and an announcement to Baal concerning the grandeur of his house.

68-71. Is Aṯirat telling El that these will be Baal's tasks or convincing him that he did the right thing? De Moor[50] believes that Aṯirat fears Baal will not drop his rains at the correct time. Is this an implication of blackmail, that Baal will have his house or withhold the rain? His translation reads like a directive issuing from Aṯirat: "Moreover, Baal should appoint the time of his rain.
The time of the *tkt* ship with snow
and the giving forth of his voice in the clouds
of his letting loose the lightenings to the earth."
He reads *glṯ* with Hermann,[51] "snow."
tkt remains obscure.

72f. Ginsberg[52] translates "The house of cedar-let him burn it Yea, the house of brick-remove it." The translation is tentative. Is Baal to clear his building site to make room for a grand pálace? He seems to be reading into the verbs the magical building by fire in col. vi in which the cedars are turned to blocks of silver.

^{c}nt (=*CTA* 3, also called V AB)

col. iv (=*CTA* 3 sec. E col. iv)

2* [wn . in .]

1* [bt̲] . l[b^{c}l . km . ilm . wḥẓr]

1 kbn . [at̲rt . mt̲b . il . mẓll]

2 bnh . m[t̲b . rbt . at̲rt . ym]

3 mt̲b . pdr[y . bt . ar . mẓll]

4 ṭly . bt . r[b . mt̲b . arṣy]

5 bt . y^{c}bdr [. mt̲b . klt]

6 knyt . wt^{c}n [. btlt . ^{c}nt]

The reconstruction is based on col. v: 46ff; UT 51: I: 10-19 and IV: 50-57. (cf. *CTA* p. 18).

translation

2* There is no

1* house for Baal like the gods, no court

1 like At̲irat's children. The dwelling of El is the residence

2 of his son. The dwelling of Lady At̲irat of the Sea

3 is the dwelling of *pdry* daughter of *ar*, the

4 residence of *ṭly* daughter of *rb*, the dwelling of *arṣy*

5 daughter of *y^{c}bdr*, the dwelling of the perfect

6 brides.

Anat addresses El requesting and demanding that Baal be given status equal to the other gods the children of Aṯirat. His brides must live with Aṯirat while he stays with his father.

The lines are repeated several times, once more in this text col. v: 46ff, and by Aṯirat also to El in UT 51:I and IV.

^{c}nt col. vi (=CTA 3 E col. vi)

5. [----] ym . rbt
6. [---] bnhrm
7. [^{c} b]r . gbl . ^{c}br
8. q^{c}l . ^{c}b . iht
9. np šmm . šmšr
10. ldgy . aṯrt
11. mġ . lqdš . amrr
12. idk . al . ttn
13. pnm . tk . ḥ[q]kpt
14. il . klh . kptr

This text is practically untranslatable.[53] The difficulties are twofold: first, the vocabulary is very difficult, and second, we do not really know who the speaker and addressee are. By far the majority of translators see Baal as the speaker addressing qdš-wamrr who is/are normally associated with Aṯirat. Ginsberg's translation makes Aṯirat the speaker which helps alleviate the problem of loyalty and her role in UT 51 in which she is the active petitioner for a house for Baal.

Lipiński[54] believes the translations are based on a faulty analysis of the particle l- which is usually taken to be a vocative:

O! Qdš w ammr, etc. He says:

> Or rien ne semble, exiger une telle option, puisqu'il ne résulte pas de la suite du texte que le Pêcher d' Aṯirat était effectivement le messager de Baal. Une autre explication est donc possible qui impliquerait une double mission de l'ambassadeur de Baal, envoyé d'abord chez le Pêcheur d'Aṯirat (lignes 7-11) et ensuite en Égypte, auprès de Kuṯar-wa-Ḫasis (lignes 12ss).

Aṯirat's messengers are then to be found at home.

Home is not clearly mapped for us. Lipínski[55] offers a new translation for the route of the envoy. It does not give us much useful information concerning the location of qdš w amrr and presumably their mistress Aṯirat.

Lipiński's suggestion is attractive in that it relieves us of having to explain Baal's use of Aṯirat's messengers by the conventional theory that Baal was in the process of becoming chief god and hence husband of the great goddess. Evidence from the OT not withstanding[56] there is precious little in the Ugaritic literature that suggests Aṯirat and Baal were on anything but cool terms.[57]

UT 49 (=CTA 6)

col. I.

39. tšu . gh . wtṣḥ . tšmḫ ht

40. aṯrt . wbnh . ilt wṣb

41. rt . aryh . kmt . aliyn

42. b^{c}l . kḫlq . zbl . b^{c}l

43. arṣ gm . yṣḥ il

44. lrbt aṯrt ym . šm^{c}

45. lrbt . a[ṯrt] ym . tn

46. aḥd . b . bnk (?) wamlkn

47. wt^{c}n . rbt . aṯrt ym

48. bl . nmlk . yd^c . ylḥn

49. wy^{c}n . lṭpn . il d(p)i

50. d . dq . anm . lyrẓ

51. ^{c}m . b^{c}l . ly^{c}db . mrḥ

52. ^{c}m . bn . dgn . ktmsm

53. w^{c}n . rbt . aṯrt ym

54. blt . nmlk . ^{c}ṯtr . ^{c}rẓ

55. ymlk . ^{c}ṯtr . ^{c}rẓ

translation and notes

Anat has just told El that Baal was dead, devoured by Mot. She continues speaking:

39. She lifted her voice and cried: "Now let

40. Aṯirat and her children rejoice, Elat and the

41. band of her kin, for dead is Aliyan

42. Baal, for perished is Prince Baal

43. of the Earth." Aloud cries El:

44. "Oh Lady Aṯirat-of-the-Sea hearken.

45. Oh Lady Aṯirat-of-the-Sea give

46. one of your sons and I will make him king."

47. Lady Aṯirat-of-the-Sea answers:

48. "Let us crown *yd^c* *ylhn*."

49. Then answered Kindly El the Benign:

50. "He is too weak to race

51. with Baal. He can't set a javlin

52. with Dagon's son *ktmsm*."

53. Then replied Lady Aṯirat-of-the-Sea,

54. "Let us crown ^{c}Aṯtar the Terrible,

55. Let ^{c}Aṯtar the Terrible rule."

In the subsequent lines ^{c}Aṯtar the Terrible proves too small to rule from Mount Şapan and he retreats to the earth to rule.

notes

40. *ht* Zijl[58] reads as *hm*, "now."

41. *şbrt aryh*. *şbrt* is a "band." *ary* are "kin" or "companions." See UT 51: II:25-26 and IV:49-50.

48. *bl* is usually negative but is sometimes positive.[59]

50. *dq* is from the root *dqq*, to be small.[60]

anm is hapax. Zijl,[61] "weak" from Heb. *'yn*. He translates the line: "One feeble of power cannot crush."

lyrz̧. Gordon[62] derives from the root *rwz̧*, "to vie with." Zijl[63] derives it from *rz̧z̧*, "to crush."

51. *^{c}m b^{c}l* is usually taken as "with Baal" or "against Baal." Zijl[64] reads *^{c}m* as "people," the people of Baal. *ly^{c}db* is "to set, arrange,"[65] "the people of Baal indeed arrange the lance." El is telling Aṯirat that Baal's people are preparing for battle.[66] This would be a strange statement in view of El's prostration upon hearing of Baal's death in UT 67 (=CTA 5 VI). El is certainly pleased at his resurrection in UT 49 iii-iv.

Yamashita[67] translates *yd^c ylḫn* the "Wise One." Aṯirat would have the wisest be king whereas El requires a strong substitute for the fallen Baal.

The god ^{c}Aṯtar is an unknown quantity in the Ugaritic and Semitic texts. Gaster[68] would make ^{c}Aṯtar the "genius of irrigation." He must descend to the earth to practice his art.

Comments on the text

1. Baal is not a son of Aṯirat's though he may be one of El's children.
2. Aṯirat is given the privilege or has the right to appoint a successor subject to El's veto. As mother of the gods she will choose their new ruler.
3. Aṯirat appoints ^{c}Aṯtar who *may* be an irrigation god who will take Baal's place in the seasonal cycle. When the rains cease, some other method of watering must be found. The suggestion of Gaster's is well taken. Irrigation waters issue from the rivers, streams and lakes and underground sources, not from the clouds which are Baal's domain.
4. El, Aṯirat, (^{c}Aṯtar), and Yam are all connected with the water in or on the earth. Baal's association is with heavenly sources. His wives, too, are the waters from the sky and the air.
5. As one of Aṯirat's sons we may well expect ^{c}Aṯtar to practice his art from the earth.

UT 49 (=*CTA* 6)

col. v

Baal has returned to life.

1. yiḫd . b^{c}l . bn . aṯrt
2. rbm . ymḫṣ bktp
3. dkym . ymḫṣ . bṣmd

4. ṣḫr mt . ymṣḫ . larṣ

5. [yṯb .] b[^{c}]l . lksi . mlkh

6. [bndgn] lkḥṯ . drk(t)h

From CTA p. 41:

4. ymṣḫ could be read ḫ or i.

5. Ginsberg and Gaster reconstruct [y^{c}] l b^{c}l.

6. possible reconstruction [nḫt].

translation:

1. Baal siezes the sons of Aṯirat

2. the great ones he strikes on the shoulder

3. the small he smites with the axe.

4. The dusty ones of Mot he pulls to the earth.

5. Ball [will sit] on the chair of his kingship

6. [Dagon's son] on the throne of his dominion

notes:

2 and 3. *rbm* and *dkym*: "great ones" and "small ones," after de Moor.[69] Ginsberg[70] gives no translation. Aistleitner[71] "sea gods," with Rin[72] perhaps "prince of the sea" or "mighty of the sea."

4. "dusty ones," after de Moor.[73]

6. de Moor[74] reconstructs l [nḫt .] lkḥṯ.

comments:

It is tempting to see *rbm* and *dkym* as sea monsters loyal to Aṯirat and Yam. In the *OT* the monster *rhb* is the enemy of Yahweh who crushes and hacks him.[75] Upon Baal's return to life he destroys those who are anti-life, particularly the sons of At̲irat and, one might expect, ^{c}At̲tar.

Krt (=CTA 14)

196. b(t̲)lt̲
197. ym[ġy .] lqdš
198. a[t̲rt .] ṣrm . wlilt
199. ṣd[yn]m . t̲m
200. yd[r . k] rt . t̲^{c}
201. iit̲t . at̲rt . ṣrm
202. wilt . ṣdynm
203. hm . ḥry . bty
204. iqḥ . aš^{c}rb . ġlmt
205. ḥẓry . t̲nh . k!spm
206. atn . wt̲lt̲n . ḫrṣm

197. Gordon and Ginsberg reconstruct ym[ġyn .].
200. there seems to be no dispute with Herdner's reconstruction.
205. written with w̲ not k̲.

translation and notes

196. On the third day
197. he arrives at the sanctuary
198. of At̲irat of Tyre, to (that of) Elat
199. of Sidon. There vowed
200. generous Keret:
201. "As At̲irat of Tyre is present and

202. Elat of Sidon.
203. If Ḥry to my house
204. I take, the maiden I bring into
205. my court, twice (her worth/weight) in silver
206. I will give three times in gold."

notes

197. most commentators translate *qdš* as holy place or shrine.[76]

198. and 199. There is debate whether this should be read Syrians and Sidonians or Tyre and Sidon. Ginsberg[77] gives both possibilities. Rin[78] makes them gentilic while Albright[79] suggests the *-m* is enclitic and we should read Tyre and Sidon. De Langhe[80] and Rainey read them as gentilics. Since the meaning or import of the lines would be virtually identical with either translation we will not pursue the question. For Elat as appellative of Aṯirat see below pp. 79-80.

200. *ṯ*^{c} after Gray,[81] "generous."

201. *iiṯt*. Rainey[82] reads, "O! an offering." *iṯt* is a type of offering, Heb. *'šh*. He gives an alternative more in keeping with other scholars' opinions, "As Aṯirat lives..." Gray[83], "By the presence of Aṯirat..." The *i-* is vocative and *iṯt* from the root *'yṯ* is cognate to Heb. *yēš*. In 3fs it means to be present. Albright[84]: "As truly as Aṯirat of Tyre is present/and Elat of Sidon". *i-* is assertive particle and it is fem. of *iṯ* "he is present", which like Heb. stative *yēš* is "to be present". Gordon[85], "exist." Since most agree that the word *iṯt* is a fem. stative similar in meaning or cognate to Heb. *yēš* the question becomes

one of intent. Does Keret vow on the life of the goddess implying a belief in the deity's existence, or is he just hoping she might be there to hear the vow? Since the deity was in residence at her temple we must assume the former statement and understand *it* to be essentially existential or affirmation of existence. To be present is to exist.

203. *hm* "if."[86]

205-206. Gray[87] prefers fractions, two-thirds, etc. to multiples.

comments:

1. At the beginning of the text El comes forth as Keret's patron in his search for a wife and progeny. El tells Keret how to go about his task or reveals to him the divine plan. Keret is called the "lad of El."

2. Aṯirat must have played some important role either in wooing[88] or in assuring dynastic succession.

UT 128 (=CTA 15)

col ii

22. tqḥ btk . ġlmt tš^{c}rb

23. ḥẓ! rk . tld . šb^c bnm lk

24. wṯmnt ṯtmnm

25. lk . tld . yḍb [.] ġlm

26. ynq . ḥlb . a(ṯ)rt

27. mṣṣ . ṯd btlt [^{c}nt]

28. mšnq[

col. iii

18. tity . ilm . lahlhm

19. dr il . lmšknthm

20. wtqrb . wld bn lh

21. wtqrb . wld . bnm lh

22. mk . bšb^c . šnt

23. bn . krt . kmhm . tdr

24. ap . bnt . hry

25. kmhm . wtḫss . aṯrt

26. ndrh . wilt . p[

27. wtšu . gh . w[tṣḥ]

28. ph m^c . ap . kr[t

29. uṯn . ndr[

30. apr . (h/i)[------

notes from CTA p. 69

col. ii

ḫẓrk written *hqrk*

24. word separation is questionable (see CTA p. 69 note 2).

translation

col. ii

22. (the woman) you take to your house, the lass you bring into

23. your court will bear seven sons to you

24. yea the eighth (time) (she will bear) Octavia.

25. She will give birth to the lad *yṣb*

26. who will suck the milk of Aṯirat

27. pull at the breast of the Virgin (Anat)

28. the wet-nurses[

col. iii

18. The gods proceed to their tents,

19. the family of El to their habitation.

20. And she came to the birth of a son of his.

21. And she came to the birth of two sons of his.

22. Lo! in seven years

23. the children of Keret were according to her vow,

24. even the daughters of ḥry

25. were so. And Aṯirat remembers

26. his vow, and Elat his [

27. She lifts her voice and [cries]

28. Look now does Keret [break]

29. Or [the king] alter [his] vow

30. So I shall break [

notes

col. ii

24. the division of the words in this line is not clear. I follow Gordon[89], the eighth "Octavia" though we lack the final *-t* and have instead *-m*. We expect the girl's name to appear here as she is important in the story.

28. Rin[90], reconstructs *mšnq[t*.

It is somewhat unusual to find Aṯirat and Anat paired, though they appear as wet-nurses of the gods also in UT 52:24, 59, 61.

Anat also offers Aqhat life eternal in Aqhat A col. vi and restores Baal to life in the Baal cycle. The two goddesses have definite life-giving, or better yet, life sustaining attributes. In the Keret epic Keret's children are more than mortal men. Yamashita[91] has covered the Ancient Near Eastern parallels adequately. It might be noted though, that while Aṯirat is the mother of the gods, Anat, outside these texts, has little that we can identify as "motherly" attributes. We cannot *ipso facto* call these goddesses fertility goddesses. They are life sustainers, those who bless with immortality or advantage, but not really life creators. It is in fact El who, as Keret's personal patron[92] in this text, blesses him and promises him numerous offspring.

col. iii.

The gods' blessing lists the children to be born to Keret and Ḥry. The gods proceed to their tents and the royal couple begins producing children.

21.-22. Herdner emends the lines to read *wtqrb . wld bnm lh wtqrb . wld . bnt lh* based on the following lines 23, 24. Following Gray[93] I prefer to read the progression, one son (child) two children, rather than, sons and daughters. Within seven years Keret had his house filled as promised by El and the gods. *wtqrb wld* is problematic. Who approaches? Is it Ḥry with the children, or is this a euphemism for sexual intercourse, or does Aṯirat draw near for each birth? It is difficult to see *wld* as a finite vb.[94] I like to read Aṯirat as the one who approaches to witness the births. The transition to Aṯirat in line 25 would be too sudden. She sees Keret's prosperity, the obvious results of taking the woman into his house and becomes angered.

28. Rin[95], reconstructs the line krt [ṭ^c].

I follow Ginsberg[96] who reconstructs krt [pr] based on Aṯirat's curse in line 30, apr.

comments

El promised Keret offspring. Keret's vow to Aṯirat in Krt was in fulfillment of bringing the girl into his house. Ginsberg[97] believes that the vows in question, i.e. the ones in UT 128 col. iii, "...were made to Asherah but contingent upon obtaining offspring not of the bride and therefore distinct from KRT A 199f." In other words some other vow to Aṯirat is lost in the lacunae while the first vows were repaid. This seems unlikely. The listing of the children and the years that had lapsed from the marriage to the reckoning of the broken vow by Aṯirat serves to emphasize the gross error made by Keret. He not only forgot to fulfill the vow when he first married, he let seven years, marked by births, pass by. He was satisfied, happy, and giving feasts (col. iv) while Aṯirat remembered.

UT 75 and 52 (=CTA 12 and 23)

UT 75 is an interesting though enigmatic text; no one has a ready place for it in the myth cycles.[98] It involves the birth of two (?) monsters the aklm and the ^{c}qqm by two (?) goddesses tlš, the maid of yrḫ and dmgy, the maid of Aṯirat.

While there is no general agreement on a translation for the section I: 14-27 the consensus is that partuition takes place in the steppe or desert. Ginsberg[99] regards the new born gods as El's children by *tlš*, *a.k.a.* *dmgy*, the handmaid of El and Aṯirat. The analogy drawn to Abraham, Sarah and Hagar is obvious but not complete.[100] Ginsberg does not deal with Yeraḫ's presence. Løkkegaard's[101] interpretation is somewhat different, he sees the text as a plan by El to destroy Baal. Jirku[102] is in general agreement with Løkkegaard. Gordon's[103] translation does not clarify the issue: "Get thee out, O Tlš, Come Moon to Dmgy! The handmaid of Asherah! Take thy..."

T. Gaster[104] reads the text in a seasonal context in which the discomfiture of Baal, god of rain, hearkens the beginning of the dry season. El created the beasts to kill Baal and is, in this myth, Baal's adversary. The maiden of the moon god and that of Aṯirat are one and the same. Since Gaster observes solar attributes in this particular El he might also be equating Aṯirat with some aspect of the moon though there is no precedent.

Though all we can determine from the story is that El sends one or two maids to give birth to adversaries of Baal, there are a few interesting points with regards to Aṯirat. Aṯirat's maid *dmgy* is the mother of one of the monsters who is fashioned for the purpose of destroying Baal. Aṯirat must also be opposed to Baal. The monster births took place in the desert or steppe which was a literary motif of the Ancient Near Eastern world.[105] By virtue of those births the desert must also have possessed some positive aspect. It is the place into which Anat, Astarte and Baal go roaming and hunting[106] and must be a place of living or useful things.

Like UT 75, UT 52 relates the birth of gods, this time they are fathered by El. The mothers, two again, are never specifically named but we assume them to be Aṯirat and probably Anat, or perhaps their hypostases.[107] Aṯirat, the creatress of the gods, suckles the baby gods to imbue them with immortality.

After their birth, El sends the gods to the desert (lines 66ff) where they live, mate, and eat. The *mdbr* is not uninhabitable though it may house monsters.

UT 52 and 75 are the only Ugaritic texts in which gods are born. In each there is reference to Aṯirat, in 75 as the mistress of maid *dmgy*, and in 52, as the one who suckles the gods. El insures the birth of the gods either by edict or by impregnating the women. Most important, the desert is represented as the birthplace of the gods or the place to which they go after birth. This is somewhat unexpected for a coastal maritime community.[108]

rbt aṯrt ym

Aṯirat's appellation in the Baal cycle (UT 51, 49, ^{c}nt =CTA 4, 6, 3) is *rbt aṯrt ym*, generally translated: "Lady Aṯirat-of-the-Sea." Another suggestion is "The Lady Who Treads on the Sea;" the participle aṯirat (the one who treads) becoming a shortened form or nickname suggestive of the longer epithet. While I agree implicitly with the fundamental premise that deities' names are shortened forms of longer descriptive titles, we must ask a number of questions for each case.

A goddess Ašratum was known as one of the wives of the Amorite god Amurru from Old Babylonian times.[109] While it is thought by some[110] that Amurru the god, and the name *a-mu-ru-um* (or some variation) was a creation of the Akkadian world there is good evidence that both the name of the people and the name of the god were West Semitic, not East Semitic or Akkadian.[111]

Amurru is called bêl šadê which, instead of the traditional rendering, "Lord of the Mountain," could be conceived of as the "Lord of the Steppe" or desert plateau.[112] Ašratum was the "Lady of the Steppe."[113] She does not show a primary contact with the West in early texts[114] and there is no apparent cause to connect her in any capacity with the sea, at least not in the OB period. In the earliest traditions she is consort/wife of the Amorite god Amurru and the Lady of the Steppe-land.

There are further references to Asherah and the Amorites in the El Amarna period.[115] The chief of the Amorites was an abdi-aširti.[116] Thus far the goddess by the name of aṯrt is clearly connected to the Amorites though as yet the origin of her name is obscure.

If we assume Aṯirat to be of West Semitic origin and at least initially specifically localized in the Amorite world we must explain how her name could be a shortened form of "The Lady Who Walks on the Sea." At this stage of our knowledge Amorites are not known to have been coastal peoples, though the possibility exists that such was the case.[117]

Even if Aṯirat was a sea goddess from earliest times, as she appears to have been later, we must question the etymology of her name. Gordon[118] gives one definition of aṯr as "to march." UT 5:24 is questionable. The verb in that line is ylk and aṯr ilm could be read as "place of the gods" or "sanctuary of the gods."

UT 51:IV:18-19 is usually translated,"Virgin Anat marches and Baal departs to the heights of Mt. Sapan." It is difficult to suggest another translation although we could read the line "... after Anat...," meaning that she follows after Aṯirat and her servants. However, to base the etymology for Aṯirat's name on one possible reference is risky. A review of the root _'ṯ/šr_ in Semitics is in order.

Early Aramaic inscriptions from Sefire[119] and Nerab[120] and Afis[121] contain the word _'šr_ meaning "place." Donner-Röllig reconstructs _'šrthm_ for Sefire B:11 and translates: "their holy place."[122] Much later _Ma^{c}sub_[123] bears the word _'šrt_ which Donner-Röllig tranlates as "heiligtum,"[124] cognate to Akk. _aširtu_, _eširtu_ and Heb. _'šrh_.

The Tema inscription[125] is the only one to bear the word _'šyr'_ as a deity's name (A 3, 16). Gibson suggests the spelling is a passive participle,"the chosen one."

To the Aramaic and Canaanite speakers _'š/ṯr_ meant a place or a special spot while the feminine _'šrh/t_ perhaps meant a holy place. This is in part corroborated by the Akkadian.

OAAK _ašarum_ (=_KI_) is the earliest attestation of the root _*AŠR_. _Ašertu_ as cult place or temple room[126] derives from _ašaru_,"plot, place or city." The three roots (_'$_1$ šr_; _'$_6$šr_ and _'$_7$šr_) do not overlap as in Hebrew. CAD (vol. 1:2) gives several examples of _ašru_ as temple or sacred place. The _aširtu_ was the sanctuary or general designation for the temple, a niche or room devoted to religious practices in a home, or a socle in the form of a sanctuary for images or symbols. Nowhere does _'$_1$šr_ in Akkadian mean to march or tread.

Arabic follows the patterns of the other Semitic languages.[127]

'ṯr means to relate, transmit, in form II, to leave a trace or impression, form V, to receive an impression. The noun means a relic, a sign, trace or vestige. In some derived stems (VIII, X) the verb bears a meaning of movement as to follow impressions or to track. The stem's aspect of motion, walking or following seems to derive from the notion of that which remains in place or the place itself.

ESA *'ṯrt* was a goddess, consort of the god *^{c}amm* (and sometimes Wadd), whose name was supposed to mean bright or shining. She may have been some aspect of the sun or moon.[128] It has not been suggested that the ESA goddess *'ṯrt* is related etymologically to the later Arabic verb meaning "to make a mark" or "a relic." She may have been an import from the North.[129] In that case we would not necessarily expect her to place the same role as her Northern namesakes.

Hebrew *'šr* as a verb is used infrequently. The G-stem (Pr 9:6) is found but one time and means to walk or tread. In the D-stem it is found in parallel construction with *bw'* (Pr 4:14) and *šm^{c}* (Pr 23:19) both meaning to heed or incline correctly. In Hos 14:9 it seems to mean "to make correct." The verb in Hebrew belongs in its semanitc range to *yšr*, which is also heavily employed in Proverbs. It means to walk or go straight or make the way straight. The word *'šr*, which is cognate to Akkadian *'$_1$šr* seems to mean a place and has but one possible occurance as a verb in Pr 9:6 and even that is questionable.

As a recognized noun *'šr* appears in Hebrew in Job, Psalms and Proverbs to mean "steps" (*'āšūr*). It is also likely that the plural *'šrym* of the feminine *'šrh*[130] indicates a cult place, perhaps a grove of trees, not necessarily devoted to a goddess Asherah. Semitic literature supports this contention.[131]

The root *'šr* in early Semitics either split into two meanings: Asherah, the goddess, and "place," or we have homonymous roots. In either case, in the extant texts the two are distinct in meaning from one another. In one case the word is a place and at times a holy place. In the other, the goddess *'trt/h* is indicated.

	DN	NOUN	VERB
Ugaritic	'aṯrt	'aṯr	'aṯr?
Akkadian	ašratu	aširtu, etc.	----
Hebrew	'šrh	'šr(h?)ym	'šr?
EA-Amorite	aširta	?	?
Arabic	'ṯrt	'uṯru etc.	'aṯar
Phoen	----	'šr/t	----
Aramaic	'ṯyr'	'šr	----

A verb *'ṯr*, "to march or tread" is unlikely in all but Arabic, and possibly Ugaritic. Some translators[132] in keeping with the posited verbal meaning of "step" or "march" translate the Ugaritic noun *'tr* as "footsteps," or "place" meaning "spot" or "location."[133]

It is unlikely that *atr* in the majority of texts could mean house or dwelling.[134] It is part of a ritual complex which includes erection of a *nṣb*, bringing forth *qṭr* from the ground and guarding from the dust his *atr*, which could well be a funerary shrine. In 121:II:2 *atr* is in parallel construction with *hkly* "my temple or palace."[135] Perhaps "his shrine" would be appropriate though in other texts we find *bt* parallel to *hkl*.[136] In the *rp'u* texts *aṯr* is synonymous with *hkl*. UT 122:11 we read "my temple is his shrine," and UT 124:3, "build your *aṯr* (shrine?)." The synonymity of *hkl* and *aṯr* is not complete; they do

UMI

not appear in positions in which they could be said to be parallel. UT 121:II:1, 2 (based on 21:3-4) says that "my *hkl*" is "his *aṯr*," not that they are for the same use, in fact we might expect there to be some difference in meaning. In UT 122:3-4 *aṯr* and *ilynm* may be parallel terms.[137] Whatever the case, it is certain that *aṯr* is not a house or dwelling rather it bears some religious significance either as a place, as a structure like *hkl*,[138] or perhaps as a movable object.[139] There is only one reference to the construction of an *aṯr*. In UT 124:3 it is built, *bn*.

Those who propose that the etymology of Aṯirat's name is *aṯr*, "to walk or tread upon," have little to support their theses in comparative Semitics. In addition, they must assume the appellation, "the Lady Who Walks on the Sea" apply across the board to all Aṯirats, or explain the same name with the Amorites and in ESA. Our earliest records of her are Amorite and seem to be associated with the steppe land. Granted she could have been called *aširtu bêlet ṣēri*, "The Lady Who Walks the Steppe," but we loose some of the mythological impact suggestive in the first appellation.[140] Evidence for a possible etymology from *'š/ṯr*, " a place" or "holy place" is strongly favored. However, any connection between the goddess's name and the "holy place" must be lost in pre-history. We must seek to determine who she was at Ugarit (and at any other place where she was revered). Obviously the Lady-of-the-Steppe would not serve a very useful function at Ugarit or Tyre where the sea provides and destroys. It is best to read *aṯrt* in the Ugaritic texts as the goddess's personal name, she is Lady-Aṯirat-of-the-Sea.

qnyt ilm and *ilt*

Aṯirat is called *qnyt ilm* only in UT 51:I:23; III:26,30,35; IV:32 (=CTA 4) and it is in parallel construction with *rbt aṯrt ym*. The root *qnu* has some possible Semitic cognates:[141] Akk. *qanū*, to acquire, Heb. *qn'* to create, acquire, Aram *qenā* also to acquire. She is the creatress of the gods who number seventy (UT 51 VI:46). In this capacity she does not seem to have a decided fertility aspect though she may be the patronness of childbirth and marriage. The epithet here is embedded in formulaic language: 51:I:22f mgn rbt aṯrt ym mġẓ qnyt ilm,
III:25f tmgnn rbt aṯrt ym tġẓy qnyt ilm
III:28ff tmgnn rbt aṯrt ym tġẓy qnyt ilm
III:33f btlt ᶜnt nmgn -m rbt aṯrt ym nġẓ qnyt ilm
IV:31f ik mġyt rbt aṯrt ym ik atwt qnyt ilm
51 frag I based on 51:I and III.

In 51:I:23 Baal (?) is told to entreat Aṯirat to intercede with El for a house. III:26 the narrator, Aṯirat, calls herself *qnyt ilm*, and in line 33 Anat addresses her as *qnyt ilm*. Finally, El in IV:32 calls Aṯirat, *qnyt ilm*.

In text 51 Aṯirat plays a particularly large role as compared with other texts of the Anat-Baal cycle texts. Her primary title is *rbt aṯrt ym*; the appellation *qnyt ilm* is used for parallel construction and is never found alone as a means of addressing Aṯirat.

As "mother of the gods" in this text her offspring are *bnh* and *ṣbrt aryh*,[142] her sons and the band of her kinsmen.[143] *Ṣbr* in Heb. is a group, or clump. *Ṣbrt* occurs only in UT 49 and 51 and *ṣbr* in 2073.

In these texts *rbt aṯrt ym* is shortened to *aṯrt* and is parallel to *ilt*.[144] The parallel forms are *rbt aṯrt ym*//*qnyt ilm* (the long form) and *aṯrt*//*ilt* (the short form). Once Anat is called *ilt* (^{c}nt II:18). It is doubtful that *ilt* refers specifically to Aṯirat as the word occurs in offering and ritual lists where it is clear Aṯirat is not intended (UT 1; 3; 173; 23; 80?). While *ilt* does mean "goddess" as *il* means "god" the parallel of *il* and chief god El and *ilt* as Elat a chief goddess is not certain. El is paired with Aṯirat (107:5; UG V:I:15?) and never with *ilt*. Hence it would seem that *ilt* was not a personal name as *il* was. Schaeffer[145] believes that the early Canaanite (substratum) pantheon was dominated by a goddess much as was that of the Hurrians. The goddess Elat had power at that time equal to El's.[146] She should not be confused with Aṯirat or considered an aspect of her as the Keret legend might show. There may be some substance to Schaeffer's contention but in the texts we have at hand *ilt* is an appellation of Aṯirat; where the name came from is another problem and there is no direct evidence that it was associated with her outside of Ugarit.[147]

qdš w ammr

The name occurs in 51:IV:2,8,13 (=CTA 4) as *qdš w amrr*, in ^{c}*nt* VI:11 as *qdš amrr*, and is split into two individuals in 51:IV:17 and possibly II:32, 33.[148]

In UT 51 *qdš w amrr* is Aṯirat's helper who prepares and saddles the donkey and who sets the goddess on the animal's back. He/they then lead the way to El's residence either as figurative guiding lights or, if El's home is located in the interior of a mountain they may be guides or lights in the dark.

The varied translations of the name *qdš w amrr* are good indications of the uncertain origin of the god/s and the name. Gordon[149] derives *amrr* from *mrr*//*brk*, to bless. Aistleitner[150] says *amrr* is a variant of *amr*, the god Amurru. Dussaud[151] agrees with Aistleitner. He is identified with Baal and *qdš* is the hypostasis of Amurru, not a reference to the goddess Aṯirat.[152] Cassuto[153] wrote that *amrr* meant exalted; he that is holy, *qdš*, is exalted above the group. He translated *qdš w amrr* "Holy-and-Favored." Buccellati[154] followed by M. Astour[155] derives *amrr* from *mrr*. While Buccellati believes the word to mean "strong" or "bitter" as in Ugaritic, Hebrew and SA, Astour defines *mrr* as "to pass," "move away from" or "traverse." Both interpret /'amurr/ "....as a phonological variant of */'amrūr/ (not attested) of the pattern 'aqtūl...".[156] Neither Buccellati nor Astour find any difficulty in assigning the word to Amorite origins.[157]

Given our Amorite bias to the problem of Aṯirat's origin it is most appealing to accept Astour's definition though we are still faced with providing an explanation for *qdš*. We know of no god named *qdš* nor of a people of that name. Some attribute the word to Aṯirat as her epitheton or appellative though this is questionable and based in large part on Egyptian and *OT* references which are themselves very obscure and explained by each other or the Ugaritic references.[158]

If *amrr* is Amurru, as seems likely, why would his status have devolved to messenger and helper of his (former) wife, Aṯirat? De Moor[159] attributes his decline to the stronger influence of urban Ugarit on the desert nomad, Amurru, who couldn't stand up to Baal the local storm god. Priority at Ugarit must be given to Baal. Such a statement would imply that Aṯirat and Amurru arrived at Ugarit together.

Qdš w amrr is also called *dgy* *aṯrt* in *ᶜnt* 6:10 and *dgy* *rbt* *aṯrt* *ym* in 51:II:31 and 51:IV:3(?). In his connection with *aṯrt* *ym* and the possible etymology of the name from *dg* "fish" he is called "fisherman".[160] *Dgy*'s action in spreading the nets in/over *ym* and his service to *aṯrt* *ym* amplifies the coastal character of the myth.[161]

The *-y* ending is not typical for professional names though there are parallels.[162] We do find the *-y* affix with feminine names and gentilics.[163]

Dgy's action is suggestive of fishing and whether we call him "fisherman" or "fishy" is not critical, though a definitive answer would be most helpful in interpreting the texts. When Aṯirat orders *dgy* to take a net we want to know if he is fishing in the sea, which is not indicated in the following text,[164] or if he is subduing the sea, *ym*, in deference to Baal and Anat's peaceable visit.[165]

dmgy

Aṯirat's maid was *dmgy* in 75:I:16. Gröndahl[166] lists her name as a possible act. ptc. *dāmigay* cognate to Arab. *dāmiġ* "der zu Hilfe kommt." She quotes another possiblity of Akk. *damaqu*, "gut sein", but rejects it because *dmq* is attested at Ugarit.[167] **dmq* is found only in text 77:50 as *dmqt*. Whether *dmgy* is "goody" or "sweety" does not tell us anything about her origins. No other Semitic deity is, to my knowledge, called *dmg* or *dmq*.

There are several comments we can make at this point regarding Aṯirat and her epithets and helpers. The name Aṯirat could well stand alone with no appellatives or epithets. As such she was a West Semitic goddess connected with the Amorites and the god Amurru, who had similar functions as Baal. She was also the wife/consort of the Ugaritic god El. Her titles *rbt aṯrt ym* and *aṯrt ṣdynm* place her firmly on the coast as does the name of her helper *dgy*. Either she was originally a sea goddess or was adopted by sea or coastal peoples at a later stage. Her bi-name *ilt* may be generic "goddess" or her title "the Goddess." Evidence for the latter is aduced from far afield.[168]

Qdš w amrr, Aṯirat's other helper (or is *dgy* an epitheton?), while possibly "Holy-and-Exalted," is more likely the name of the god Amurru compounded with his epithet *qdš*, "holy." This god was no coastal deity; he belonged in the Syrian steppe,[169] probably riding a donkey.[170] It appears quite likely that our Aṯirat was Amurru's consort transplanted to the Western coast. Both traditions are found embedded in the epic texts and are most apparent in Aṯirat's epithets and the names of her helpers.

Succession

There is sufficient internal evidence in the Ugaritic materials to support the thesis that Aṯirat protects and sustains divine and human royal succession. The texts which deal with the topic are UT 49, I Krt; RS 17. 159.

UT 49:I:1-15 Anat reports to El that Baal has perished and Aṯirat and her sons should rejoice. The implication is clear enough, Aṯirat and her company were hostile to Baal and his. Aṯirat was then invited by El to name a replacement for Baal from among her sons. Her first choice, *yd^{c} ylhn*,[171] was rejected by El as too weak to run and toss the javelin with Baal--he could not take Baal's place. Aṯirat then nominated *^{c}ttr ^{c}rẓ* who was too small to rule from Baal's throne and had to descend from the heights of *ṣpn* to the earth. Baal's job is to provide the rains in their season and thus the fertility of the earth.[172] His successor we might expect, would have to fulfill the same functions. Surely Aṯirat and El in replacing Baal, strive to maintain the "normal" earthly activities. In the absence of "rain" (Baal) the "irrigator" (^{c}Aṯtar) may well be a suitable substitute.[173]

The rivers, streams, and lakes belong to the world of El.[174] These feed the canals and irrigation channels. We must admit that the evidence is in favor of an astral ^{c}Aṯtar, but that he may do more for the earth than shine upon it. Aṯirat, in nominating ^{c}Aṯtar, insures succession and also provides for the continuing fertility of the earth. El appeals to her to place one of *her* sons as king of the earth.[175] As El's wife, and probably his only wife or chief wife, she had the privilege and perhaps also the right to choose the successor to fallen Baal.

In the human epic of King Keret, *Krt* 197-206, Keret vows to Aṯirat gold and silver for a wife.[176] He needs a wife to provide the progeny necessary for continuation of the dynasty promised by El, the head of the pantheon.[177] Even though the future was insured by El, Keret vows to Aṯirat who subsequently exacts payment from him for the broken vow. She and Anat are to suckle the youth who will benefit from the divine milk.[178]

The role of the chief wife in questions of succession is set forth in RS 17.159, an Akkadian text from Ugarit. It records the history of the marriage and divorce proceedings of King Ammištamru II and the "daughter of Bentešina of Amurru." Stipulated in the agreement is that Utrišarruma, the heir apparent, son of the daughter of Bentešina, be allowed to inherit the throne even though his mother is banished. He may not, on pain of removal, reinstate his mother when he succeeds to the throne.[179] There was no rule assuring a particular son's accession to the throne but the son of the chief or first wife seems to have had precedence.[180]

It was entirely appropriate that Aṯirat appoint a replacement for Baal. She was chief goddess and probably chief wife of El. Her children, like Keret's (suckled by the goddess) would have divine prerogatives.

Summary

Aṯirat is an autonomous diety at Ugarit. Her roles and attributes have not been totally subsumed under Anat's control, though there is considerable overlap in dialogue in UT 49, 51 and ^{c}*nt*.

She was at home in the Syrian steppe with her consort, now servant, Amurru. The gods, children of Aṯirat, are born in the desert. She suckles them as she does human royalty and guarantees succession. I do not see her as a love or fertility goddess but this may have been one of her attributes. On the whole, fertility was a function of the storm god, whom she sponsored in UT 51.

Her somewhat ambivalent attitude towards Baal and her relationship with El will be discussed more fully below in the general conclusions. She is at times openly hostile to Baal and at other times his most eloquent spokesperson. Her marriage to El appears less than complete but this is due, I believe, more to historical circumstance than to El's faltering sexual prowess.

The coastal flavor of the myths emerges in her name Lady-Aṯirat-of-the-Sea, the name of her servant *dgy*, and her marriage to El. Her desert background is reflected in her servant Amurru and the desert birthplace of the gods.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. Obermann, J., UgM, 83-87; J. de Moor, AOAT 16, 38ff; G. R. Driver, Can Myth, Intro., and others all outline these questions though none is willing to accept variant traditions as the solution, instead rather elaborate stories are created to fill the missing action. See also forthcoming dissertation by Charles Bowman, The Goddess Anat.

2. Ug M&E, 131.

3. BOS, 120.

4. UL, 28.

5. UgM, 132.

6. MKT, 37.

7. UT paragraph 9.21.

8. UF 6, 32.

9. op. cit., 37.

10. op. cit., 129, n. 19.

11. Cf. Deitrich et. al., UF 6, 32.

12. UgM, 38; Can Myth, 15; Ug M&E, 132; UL, 29; de Moor, AOAT 16, 145; T. Gaster, Thespis, 178; BOS, 125.

13. Can Myth, 15.

14. de Moor AOAT 16, 145; BOS 125.

15. BOS, 125.

16. de Moor AOAT 16, 44.

17. MKT, 38.

18. UL, 29.

19. de Moor AOAT 16, 143.

20. UL, 29.

21. UgM&E, 133.

22. Thespis, 178.

23. de Moor AOAT, 16, 143.

24. Mary Wakeman, God's Battle with the Monster. Leiden, 1973. passim.

25. "Marginalia to M. Dahood's Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology," JBL 65 (1966) 4. 463.

26. Contra Dahood, ibid., 24.

27. de Moor AOAT 16, 146.

28. Cassuto, BOS, 178 ff compares the text to Dan.I 49-60. I follow his reconstruction of the first part of the column on p. 179.

29. 'tr is "after." Cf. Pope, "Marginalia," 459.

30. Clifford, R. J., Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament. 48 ff.

31. UgM&E, 133.

32. op. cit., 48ff.

33. ibid.

34. ibid., 56.

35. See page 53 . UgM&E, 133.

36. BOS, 131.

37. UL, 131.

38. Cassuto, BOS, 131f.

39. UgM&E, 133.

40. YGC, 122 n. 30.

41. Ibid., article by H. Hamberger, "A Hoard of Syrian Tratacrachms and the Tyrian Bronze Coins from Gush Halav," IEJ 4(1954).

42. Ibid., pl. 21 no. 138.

43. "Recent Books on Archaeology and Ancient History," BASOR 139 (1955). p. 25.

44. Cf. Dahood, M., "Textual Problems in Isaia," CBQ 22 (1960). 407-8.

45. UgM, 81.

46. In AOAT 10, 100ff.

47. "Ugaritic hm-Never 'Behold'," UF 1 (1969), 202.

48. Cf. Gordon's notes in UT glossary 2755.

49. Cf. above note 40.

50. AOAT 16, 150. Translation p. 68.

51. "Aštart," 10.

52. UgM&E, 133.

53. Cf. the varied translations: UgM&E, 138; Caquot and Sznycer as quoted in Lipiński, Syria 50,p. 35; UL 23; MKT, 31

54. In Syria 50, p. 35 and 36.

55. Ibid., 36.

56. Cf. Yamashita, T., The Goddess Asherah, passim.

57. I also regard the Hittite story of Elkunirsha and Ashertu as reflecting only Hittite and Hurrian traditions. Again, cf. Yamashita, op. cit. 31-38.

58. P. J. van Zijl, AOAT 10, 187.

59. UT glossary 466.

60. UT glossary 695.

61. Op. cit., 190.

62. UT glossary 2309.

63. Op. cit., 63.

64. Ibid., 192.

65. UT glossary 1818.

66. AOAT 10, 195.

67. Yamashita, T., The Goddess Asherah, 77.

68. Thespis, 122.

69. Cf. de Moor, NYCI: 2,6.

70. UgM&E, 141.

71. *MKT*, 22 n. n.

72. *Acts of the Gods*, 227.

73. *NYCI*:2, 6.

74. Ibid.

75. M. Wakeman, op. cit., 56-61. Is 14:4; Job 26:12-13; 9:13, Ps 89:10-11; Ps 40:5, is *râbbim* pl. of *rhb*?

76. Rin, *Acts of the Gods*, 302; Gray, *The KRT Text*, 55; de Langhe, "Les Textes de Ras Shamra Ugarit," 122; *UgM&E*, 145. *Contra*. Albright, *BASOR* 94, 30 n. 4, "holiness" as epithet of Aṯirat. Cf. infra 80-81 for discussion of epithets *qdš*.

77. *UgM&E*, 145 n. 17.

78. *Acts of the Gods*, 302.

79. "A Vow to Asherah in the Keret Epic," *BASOR* 94 (1944), 30.

80. De Langhe op. cit., 112. A. F. Rainey, *Social Stratification of Ugarit*, 14. Cf. M. Astour, "North Mesopotamian Locale of the Keret Epic," *UF* 5 (1973) 29-39. P. 34 says *srm* and *sdynm* are North Mesopotamian, not coastal.

81. J. Gray, op. cit., 55. *UgM&E*, 145; t^c is epithet of Keret "the noble." *UT*, glossary 2713, t^c is name of Keret's clan.

82. Op. cit., above note 80, p. 14.

83. Op. cit., 16 and 55.

84. "A Vow...," in *BASOR*, 94, 30.

85. *UT* glossary 418, *'ṯ*.

86. Cf. de Moor, "Ugaritic *hm-* ..." in *UF* 1 (1969), 201f.

87. Op. cit., 57.

88. Ibid., 55.

89. *UT* glossary 2698. Cf. also Rin, *Acts of the Gods*, 324, 328.

90. Op. cit., 328.

91. Yamashita, T., *The Goddess Asherah*, 111ff.

92. Cf. J. Gray, op. cit., 5.

93. Op. cit., 19. Contra. *Ug M&E*, 146.

94. *MKT*, 218. *UgM&E*, 146.

95. Op. cit., 329.

96. *UgM&E*, 146. Also, "The Legend of King Keret. A Canaanite Epic of the Bronze Age," *BASOR Supp. St.* 2-3. 1946.

97. Ibid., 23f.

98. Van Zijl, *AOAT* 10, 7-10.

99. "Ba^{c}lu and His Brethren," *JPOS* 16 (1936). 139.

100. Ibid., 141 n. 5.

101. F. Løkkegaard, "The House of Baal," *AOr* 22 (1955). 11.

102. A. Jirku, *Der Mythus der Kanaanaer*. Bonn, 1966. 21.

103. *UL*, 53.

104. T. Gaster, "The Harrowing of Baal," *AOr* 16 (1937). 41ff.

105. Ibid., 42. Monsters inhabit desert regions.

106. Cf. infra. pp. 154-156.

107. Cf. *UT* 128. The gods suck at the breast of Aṯirat and Anat. The action in *UT* 52 takes place in *šd ilm*, *šd aṯrt* and *šd rḥmy*.

108. Note also that Keret marches across the desert to find his bride. Gray, *Legend of King Keret*, 3ff. Astour, M., "A North Mesopotamian Locale..." *UF* 5, 29ff for opposing views.

109. For a complete discussion Cf. Yamashita, T., *The Goddess Asherah*, 3-30; *WdM*, 97; *ESP*, p. 15 n. 6.

110. *ESP*, 16. Also supported by Dr. W. Heimpel, U.C., Berkeley.

111. The problem revolves around the question, is the word (and by extension the name of the people) *Amurru*, East Semitic or West Semitic? Did they call themselves Amorite or did the Akkadians so name them? G. Buccellati, *The Amorites of the Ur III Period*, says: "While it is possible to consider *A-mu-ru-um* as the hypocoristic form of a name like *A-mur-Dingir*... and therefore Akkadian, I prefer to consider it as a tribal name (-MAR.TU) used as a personal name..." p. 133. Also, it is possible that "...*MAR.TU*, to be read *mar-tu*, is derived from *Amarru(m)* < *^{c}Amurru(m)*, and that *Amurrum(m)* should be interpreted as Amorite, rather than Akkadian..." p. 171. Cf. also I. J. Gelb, "Early History of the West Semitic Peoples," 41ff. We can add to this that in the Ugaritic tablets (RS 20.162:6, 18; the land of the Amorites is written *$^{mat\ M}$a-mur-ri* (for other references in Ugaritic cf. *Ugaritica* V, 114). Clearly

in the West Semitic world (or, if one prefers, the area of the coastal Semites) the Amorites were known by the name Amurru (or some close variant). Their god was also called Amurru. There is no reason to consider the word *a-mur-ru* anomolous at Ugarit. The Amorites called themselves by the same name.

Astour, M., *RSP* II, 340. Amurru in syllabic texts "...of Ras Shamra the geographical term *Amurru* is used exclusively for the central Syrian state of that name." Also with reference to the gentilic *amry* Astour says, p. 260, that it refers to a "man from the (Central Syrian) state of Amurru," not in the comprehensive use it had in UrIII and OB documents.

112. Kupper, J-R., "L'iconographie du Dieu Amurru," *Memoires Academie Royale de Belgique*, 55:1 (1961), 62.

113. Ibid., n. 6.

114. Ibid, 63.

115. Knudtzon, *Die El Amarna Tafeln*, nos. 60, 61, 101. Also see Yamashita, T., *The Goddess Asherah*, 21ff.

116. *EA* texts 63-65.

117. Cf. *PRU* IV, 17 and 295; *UG* V 37:24-16. These texts mention access to the sea and boats. Gelb, in *EHSP* p. 42, surmises that in the El Amarna period the country of Amurru reached the sea in the area of Şumur and Irqata.

118. *UT* glossary 424.

119. *KAI* 222:A5,B3.

120. *KAI* 225:8.

121. *KAI* 202:B21.

122. Cf. above note 119. Also Fitzmeyer, J., *Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*. [*Biblica et Orientalia*, 19] p. 65.

123. *KAI* 19:4.

124. *KAI* vol. II, 27f.

125. Gibson, vol. II, 148ff.

126. Gelb, I. J. *Glossary of Old Akkadian*, 76-78. Bezold, C., *Babylonisch-Assyrisches Glossar*, 75.

127. Lane, E. W., *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, Bk.I, Pt. 1.

128. *WdM*, 497.

129. Caskel, W., "Die alten Semitischen Gottheiten in Arabien," *ADS*, 110.

130. In some cases. See *infra*. Ch. 1.

131. Although only one of the ᶜArjud inscriptions has been published by Zeev Meshel in *BA* 39:1 (1976), another inscription bears the word *'šrth*. (Private communication from D. N. Freedman.) Since the inscription is as yet unpublished I do not relate it in its entirety. However, there is good reason to translate *'šrth* as "his cult place." If the site was a Phoenician outpost or way-station as Meshel suggested the use of *'šrt* is in keeping with our knowledge of Phoenician and we might suspect the Hebrews were familiar with the same vocabulary.

132. *UgM&E* 150, and Gaster, *Thespis*, 333.

133. The duties of the son of a deceased parent are: to set up monuments, burn incense and guard the *place* (on earth). Gaster, *Thespis*, 339, divides 2 Aqhat I:25-35 into three sections: the duties of the son are to erect and maintain ancestral funerary rites,(27-8), keep the home fires burning,(29-30), protect the father's reputation, and general home maintenance. Ginsberg, *UgM&E*, 150, includes in the duties to the dead, "from dust guards his footsteps," which is none too clear.

134. Gaster, *Thespis*, passim. 2 Aq I, II;121;62;67.

135. Cf. UT 122:2, 11; 123:5,10.

136. UT 122:1,2; 123:A:1,2.

137. Cf. CTA p. 94 n. 2.

138. UT 8:7-8, *'atr 'atrm*.

139. Contra. Reed, Wm., *The Asherah*..., 84-5, "But the RŠ texts offer no parallel to the 'asērā which the Dt...desired to destroy."

140. Cf. Albright *ARI*^{5}; Cross, *CMHE*, 30; de Moor, *AOAT* 16, 145.

141. *UT* glossary 2249; *WUS* 2426.

142. 51:I:9; IV:49; II:25; and 49:I:12 and ᶜnt VI:V:45

143. *UT* glossary 349.

144. 51:IV:49; I:12; ᶜnt VI:V:45; 49:I:12; 128:III:26; Krt IV: 198, 202.

145. "El, Elat et Asherat," *Hommages á André Dupont-Sommer*, 148.

146. She sat on a throne in UT 23:1,2. Cf. Schaeffer, Claude, op. cit., p. 148 and fig. 8.

147. *Illat* was an early Semitic god whose name meant "clan", and was probably the deification of social phenomenon, *ESP* 35, 59, 97 note 249. The double/l/would be unrecognizable in the Ugaritic. Cf. Gelb *MAD* 3, p. 39f. *'$_1$ll*, *'llatum* "power?" or "family?." Such a linguistic problem is beyond the scope of this paper but one of the names associated with Aṯirat, a probable Amorite deity, Amrūr (Cf. infra p. 80) could be joined by another Amorite deity *illat*/*ilt*. Note though that *illat* seems to be a god or masc. noun in Akk. Cf. Bezold C., *Babylonisch-Assyrische Glossar*, 36, *ellatu*: Sippe, Verband, Rudel?

148. Cf. de Moor, *AOAT* 16, 143.

149. UT glossary 233.

150. *WUS* 289.

151. Dussaud, R., *Les découvertes de Ras Shamra (Ugarit) et l'Ancien Testament*, 101.

152. Ibid., 107 n. 5.

153. *BOS*, 183.

154. Buccellati, op. cit., 134.

155. M. Astour, "Review of G. Buccellati, *The Amorites of the Ur III Period*," in *JNES* 28 (1969), 223.

156. Buccellati, op. cit., 133f.

157. Cf. infra note 111.

158. De Moor, *AOAT* 16, 129; Stadelmann *SPGA*, passim; Albright *ARI*, 74-76. Contra. Yamashita, op. cit., 118ff. He has an excellent summary of those arguments for equating Aṯirat with *qdš*. He rejects the equation Aṯirat//qdš.

159. *AOAT* 16, 52.

160. Cf. Buccellati, op. cit., 137. Is Amurru the *dgy*, fisherman, and is this the name *Ba-ir-ra-núm*, "fisherman"?

161. De Moor *AOAT* 16, 16, 53. Note also that *mt*'s flesh is sown in the sea. This is a reference to the importance of the sea in the life of Ugarit though *mt*'s home is the steppe or the subterranean mire.

162. De Moor *AOAT*, 16, 143.

163. Cf. infra.p. 82. Atirat's maid is *dmgy* in 75:I:16-17. Also UT paragraph 8.54.

164. UT 51:II:32-36 and col. iii in which the meal is of cattle and wine, not fish!

165. De Moor *AOAT* 16, 144 n. 2.

166. *PNU*, 70.

167. Note that the *g/q* interchange in Akk. may explain *dmg* at Ugarit as opposed to *dmq*. Moscati, *CGSL*, 8.39, 40 says that /q/ replaces /g/in *Krt*:223 in *ṯiqt* for *ṯigt*. Also UT 5,37 and Dahood, *Ug-H Phil*, 9. See M. Held, "mh ṣ/*mhš in Ugaritic and other Semitic Languages," *JPOS* 79(1959) 169ff, and Pope's comments in *JSS* 11(1966), 233.

168. Cf. infra. Ch. 1 and Ch. 2 note 147.

169. Kupper, J-R., "L'iconographie du Dieu Amurru," *Mémoires Académie Royale de Belgique*. Passim. Buccellati, G., *Amorites of the Ur III Period*, 235-250. I. J. Gelb, "EHSP," passim. See esp. pp. 45-47.

170. Aṯirat's animal is a donkey, *^{c}r* or *pḥl*. The Amorites were well known for their animals and horse training. Cf. note 45 p. 41 of Gelb's article, "EHSP." UT 51:I:42 reads: ṣ^c . il . dqt . kamr. *UgM&E*, 132: Gorgeous bowls shaped like small beasts like those of Amurru." He translates *dqt* as "small beast." De Moor *AQAT* 16, 50: A divine bowl, the handle of which, was as in Amurru. *Dqt* is ordinarily translated "head of small cattle," UT glossary 695.

171. Cf. infra. notes and text pp. 60-63.

172. See esp. UT 51:V.

173. Gaster in *Thespis*, 11 ff., claimed ^{c}Aṯtar was the "genius of irrigation, who seeks to dominate the earth during the time of year when the rains (Ba^{c}al) are absent." This opinion is not very popular and most critics of the Sumero-Akkadian scholarly world, the Arabian penninsula and the Eastern Mediterranean littoral, fix ^{c}Aṯtar firmly in the heavens as Venus. Yet the astral quality of ^{c}Aṯtar does not explain any of his actions in the myths, what his attributes are or his mode of action which allow him to replace Baal. It should not be inferred from references in Ugaritic texts that ^{c}Aṯtar had no character of his own (Cf. Caquot, in *Syria* 35, 45-60). We should search in further studies to determine exactly what it is that is lost when Baal dies and how it can be restored.

174. Clifford, *Cosmic Mountain*, 35-56.

175. Van Selms, A., *Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature*, 139.

176. Infra. notes pp. 65-71.

177. Rainey, A. F., Social Stratification of Ugarit, 9 ff. UT 128:II:12-28.

178. III Krt II:26-28; 52:23-24, 58-61. T. Yamashita, The Goddess Asherah, 112-114, lists some other Near Eastern parallels.

179. Yaron, R., "A Royal Divorce at Ugarit," Or, 32 (1963) 21 ff.

180. Ibid., 30. Cf. also Ju 9:18; Gen 30; 2 Sa 6:23. (The chief wife's sons will not inherit made explicit.) David's choice of Solomon was by petition of Bathsheba and the death of the prior claimants: 2 Sa 11; 2 Sa 12; 1 Ki 1. The texts read as if the expected order of succession were overturned.

INTRODUCTION TO CHAPTERS III AND IV

Contrary to scholarly opinion[1] concerning the role and function of Astarte in the Ancient Near East the following pages will reveal the paucity of information recorded about her in the Old Testament and Ugaritic literatures. This is an interesting contrast to Asherah about whom considerably less is written and about whom the texts reveal a great deal more.

This study will be confined to a textual/literary analysis of her role and importance at Ugarit and in the Old Testament world. For the Ugaritic corpus this is complicated since the texts are of diverse nature, fragmentary and derive from varied sources and dates. It is also difficult considering the small number of texts which describe the goddess in action. Though the name appears frequently very little is actually said about her. Negative evidence is tricky and does not leave the critic room to move in the event of subsequent discoveries. Nevertheless it is important to isolate the material and study it as a single body--not to begin with extra-Ugaritic texts and work in, finally to include them. It is obvious that the Egyptians, Greeks, or whomever came in contact with the Canaanites and Phoeniciahs viewed the foreign goddesses and gods through their own unique religious experience. The initial stage of an investigation is not the place to introduce what was said 600 years after the civilization died.

The Biblical materials present their own problems. The six or seven occurrences of the name Astarte do not give us much to work with. The exegesis of the passages is very difficult and at times almost impossible. Despite the problems the task will prove useful and some new information will be presented. The methodology will involve a careful examination of all pericopes containing the name of Astarte. The semantic range of the word will be of prime importance when, as we shall see, it occurs exclusively in formulaic expressions. Working with the materials we will be able to derive the formulas from earlier ones and suggest the implications.

Finally, there is no iconography of Astarte in Syro-Palestine. The only iconography we have of her was found in Egypt and none of the depictions of the goddess relate directly to anything we know from the Northwest Semitic world of the Canaanites and Hebrews. The figurines called "Astarte plaques" found in Palestine cannot be said with any confidence to depict Astarte.[2] The Egyptian material on Astarte has been studied admirably by J. Leclant[3] and R. Stadelmann.[4] I will summarize and comment on these and other relevant works in the excursus on "Astarte in Egypt."

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION TO CHAPTERS III AND IV

1. Cf. infra. Introduction, 1ff.

2. Pritchard, J. B., Palestinian Figurines in Relation to Certain Goddesses Known Through Literature. 1943.

3. Jean Leclant, "Astarté a cheval d'aprés les représentations Égyptiennes," Syria 37 (1960), 1-67.

4. Syrisch-pälestinische Gottheiten in Ägypten. 1967.

Chapter III

ASTARTE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Geographical Name

In the *OT* the word ^{c}*štrt* appears infrequently. Words derived from this root function as a geographical name, divine names and in addition, as a common noun and adjective. In the past there has been much speculation concerning the origin and nature of this word in the *OT*. We know other Semitic languages contain in their lexica cognates to the Biblical word. The cognates, too, display a similar range of functions: place name, divine name and common noun.

The word ^{c}*štrt* occurs in the *OT* in the majority of instances as a geographical name (GN). Most often it is a place name associated with Og the king of Bashan.[1] The city has been identified with the modern tell Astarah in Southern Syria on the Golan Heights. According to Biblical texts ^{c}Aštarot was one of the cities given to the tribe of Manasseh.[2] In Gen 14:5 ^{c}Aštarot is compounded with *qrnym*.

As a GN ^{c}*štrt* is found as early as the 19th cent. B.C. in the Execration texts from Egypt. Tutmosis III's campaign to the North lists ^{c}*štrt* in the third group of names. The campaign is said to have taken place in c. 1468 B.C. The El Amarna texts from 1402-1347 B.C. contain the word ^{alu}*aš-tar-ti* as a royal city which bordered on the Kingdom of Hazor.[3] The existence of the city in the period of the conquest is documented in Joshua and Deuteronomy.

Chapter 14 of the book of Genesis is problematic. The verse in question, v. 5, is an apparent gloss of the word ^{c}*štrwt* with *qrnym*.

Y. Aharoni[4] believes the entire chapter reflects an ancient tradition which was later glossed in order to define later or contemporary terms. Thus double names, as *^{c}štrwt-qrnym*, mean "^{c}Aštarôt which is qarnayim." ^{c}Aštarôt, the capital of ancient Bashan lay near Qarnayim which inherited its place as the regional capital under the Arameans and Assyrians. The city lay on the original King's Highway, the Northern portion of which was called "the way of Bashan" in Nu 21:33, Dt 3:1. That section traversed the land from Heshbon to ^{c}Aštarôt in Bashan. ^{c}Aštarot lay very close to the junction of the *via Maris* and the King's Highway.[5] Aharoni considers the name to be theophoric though he does not suggest the origin.[6]

A final possible reference to the city of ^{c}Aštarôt of Bashan is that of Sanchuniathon as related by Eusebius in *Praep. Ev*. 38c. The double name of ^{c}Aštarôt-qarnayim derives from a story that Astarte set the head of a bull on her own head before she founded and devoted the city of Tyre for herself.[7] If Aharoni and Astour are correct in their analysis of Gen 14 the story presented by Eusebius is late--after the establishment of the Aramean and Assyrian hegemony.

The history behind the founding and naming of the city is unknown. Though the name existed in Palestine for a considerable period of time, from the beginning of the second millenium B.C., this tells us nothing of the derivation and spread of the goddess's worship. The name may very well have derived from an original cult spot dedicated to her in early Canaanite times.

It is peculiar that the name as written out in Egyptian texts and the Akkadian of El Amarna, bears the feminine *-t* ending which appears in the Mari texts of the upper Euphrates from the middle to the end of the Third millenium B.C.[8] Mari is the only Mesopotamian site to yield texts with this spelling. When they wrote or read *^{d}es$_{4}$-dar*, or *^{d}INANNA* they read Ištar or Inanna, not Ištarat or ^{c}Aštarat. Is the latter form our Astarte? The first we read of an *^{c}štrt* with feminizing *-t* is at Mari for the goddess's name and in the Execration texts for the GN. At this point we do not know why or how the city in Bashan came to be called Aštarôt; its importance as a cult center devoted to the goddess's worship is not attested to in any of the contemporary literature.

Deuteronomy

In the book of Deuteronomy the word *^{c}štrwt* appears four times (Dt 7:13, 28:4, 18, 51) in a series of blessings and curses. *^{c}štrwt* is compounded with the word for small cattle or sheep, *ṣ'n*. The usual translation for the expression *^{c}štrwt ṣ'n*, is "increase of the flock" or "fertility of the flock." Twice, Dt 7:13 and 28:4, it is in a blessing: God will love Israel and cause her to prosper through increased fertility. Her crops, children, cattle and sheep will multiply. There is no point in trying to dissociate the deity Astarte from this expression. The difficulty involves her appearance in the expression. It is known that Ištar of Mesopotamia and the later Atargatis, the *Dea Syria*, were goddesses of fertility and increase. The Phoenician goddess, *^{c}ṯtrt*, was also the protectress of nature and the animal world; she was the guardian of birth.[9] How the name of the goddess Astarte became a common noun remains to be discovered. Though we know the fertility function of Ištar for the East, can we determine from internal evidence that the same held true for the West Semites?

Alongside *^{c}štrwt* in Dt we also find *šgr*, which is translated, "offspring." In a recently published text from Ugarit[10] one line in a sacrifical text reads: *[ᶜṯt]rt š šgr w iṯm š* ... The text lists the type and number of sacrifice for each god and goddess. L. Fisher[11] has suggested a parallel in the Ugaritic text for those of the above mentioned Biblical pericopes. He tries to draw a parallel between the two terms used in Deuteronomy and the same words found in the Ras Shamra texts. It is true the *šgr* is mentioned directly following *ᶜttrt*. The text, however, lists many deities and their offerings, not only *ᶜttrt* and *šgr*. He mentions that, "These names of divinities have become common nouns in Hebrew just as the Ugaritic gods *dgn* and *trt* have been transmutted into Hebrew common nouns."[12] The notion of de-mythologizing in the *OT*, especially in the book of Deuteronomy, is accepted, but Fisher seems to suggest that there was some direct interplay between the Ugaritic gods and those whom the Hebrews knew. He also indicates that the god's name became the common noun. It seems more probable that the change took place in the opposite direction--that the common noun became the name of the god. It is true that in some cases, as with Rešep, the word entered Hebrew as a noun, where in other cultures it was a god's name.[13] Where god and object or force are identical or identified, as *dgn* or *trt* and appear in the lexicon as divine name and noun, we can assume the process which Fisher proposes to have taken place. Unfortunately, in no other Semitic language does *ᶜttrt* or *ᶜaštarot* or Ištar appear as a lexical item of the quality suggested by Fisher. We might also add that the same list on lines 7 and 18 of the reverse side give *ᶜttrt* without *šgr*.[14] There was no expression in the Ugaritic literature similar to *ᶜštrwt ṣ'n* and *šgr 'lp* in Dt.

Recently M. Delcor reviewed the literary and archaeological evidence which bears on the idiom in Dt.[15] While there is little, if any archaeological material that can tie Astarte to the idea expressed in Dt there are some possibilities of a literary and etymological nature. The blessing or curse of fertility is common in the literature of the ancient Near East.[16] In Mesopotamian literature Ištar has a special relationship to flocks and their fertility as well as to human fertility. When Ištar descends to the underworld, animal reproduction ceases.[17] A hymn to Ištar reads: "Bow down to Ištar, the goddess of your city, that she may grant you offspring; take thought for your livestock, remember the planting."[18] Delcor quotes another hymn which links Ištar directly to planting and animal husbandry. She walks before the animals, loves the herds, the entire countryside is her pasture. Her domain extends to the irrigated fields and the irrigation canals. She causes the canals to open and close and the water to be contained in the furrows.[19] While all this is true of Ištar in the Assyro-Babylonian sphere, the Ugaritic, Palestinian and Egyptian Astarte have little discernable direct relationship to fertility and the flocks *per se*. Delcor tries to circumvent this problem by connecting the etymology of the word to the goddess's function as a fertility goddess. He relates several Arabic words: SA *ᶜaṯarîy* and *ġtr*, both having to do with irrigated fields and rich vegetation, and Heb. *ᶜašar*, to be rich, and construes them in the *Gt* of the Akkadian paradigms. The function and attributes then would correspond to the goddess's name.[20] Unfortunately a *-t-* infix would yield either *ᶜṯtr* or *ᶜtṯr*, infixed or assimilated but not metathesized. Regardless of the faulty grammar, Delcor is trying to do the same as Fisher in proposing a meaning for the name of the goddess which is not attested in any of the Semitic literatures.

In the pericopes of Dt. dgn and trš are substantives which have deified equivalents in other Semitic languages and literatures. So far we have no such information on Ištar or Astarte. To prove the case I would like to see the use of ^{c}štrt in some other context in Near Eastern literature. The formation of the goddess's name may well derive as Delcor and others have suggested but it is hard to imagine that the reverse process is attested to only in Dt. The suggestion then, is that the name of Astarte retained its meaning as a common noun alongside that of the proper name and that the Hebrews, in de-mythologizing, used only the common noun. It may be pure coincidence that no other cases of this particular word exist in the OT and other Semitic languages. Perhaps one should not be looking at all for a connection between Astarte and sheep or fertility but for a treaty or curse formula which lists the deities dgn, trš ^{c}štrt and šgr. In copying such a text the Israelites could not invoke gods of particular natural forces. They were forced to either use them as common nouns in the case of dgn and trš, or use the names in combined forms.

The origin of the expression is then debatable. That the expression has no precedent in the pre-Deuteronomic literature is also an argument against a Ugaritic source which would be dated at least some 600 years earlier.

The critics attributed the powers of fertility to Astarte of the OT largely on the basis of the above pericopes. As we shall see below, the Astarte which the Israelites knew was a foreign goddess and there is no internal evidence that she was seen as imbued with any particular qualities. In fact the *OT* has so purged foreign gods of any attributes or powers that very little is left but the name and even that has been hollowed out and refilled according to Hebrew sensibilities.

I Kings 11

The nine remaining occurances of *ᶜštrt* in the *OT* appear in two forms, singular and plural. They have distinct meanings and are apparently unrelated. It has been noted at length that the two forms refer to different ideas.[21] Those *ᶜštrt*'s vocalized according to *bôšet* (i.e. *ᶜaštôret*) refer to the goddess Astarte.[22] She is specifically the goddess of the Sidonians, or more generally, the Phoenicians.[23] From the notices in 1 and 2 Kings we know nothing about her cult save that Solomon, in his old age, built a *bamah* for her (2 Ki 23:13).[24] In the earlier pericope, 1 Ki 11:4ff, which describes Solomon's apostasy, he is said to have devoted the *bamah* to Chemosh and Molech. Solomon's heart was inclined to other gods and he himself followed after, *hlk 'hry ᶜštrt*, the goddess of the Sidonians and after Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites. The final prophetic notice of 1 Ki 11:33 tells that the kingdom will be lost to Solomon's descendants because, "he (Heb. "they") abandoned God and bowed to ᶜAštôret the goddess of the Sidonians ..."[25]

According to the critics, the kernal of 1 Ki 11:1-13 is quite old, or at least not the total fabrication of the compilar or redactor. Fohrer[26] believes that the Dtr author (or redactor) who characteristically looked for idolatry as the motive force for a monarch's failure, was largely responsible for verses 1-13. This is supported in part by Weinfeld who assigns most of verse 4 to the Dtr school.[27] Verses 5 and

10 also contain Dt and Dtr expressions.[28] He also assigns parts of 1 Ki 11:33 to Dtr traditions.[29] Driver[30] attributes verses 3 and 7 to an older tradition which was later set into the schema of apostasy by a compiler who also re-worded verses 32-39. The description of the darkest hours of Solomon's reign can, he says, be safely attributed to the Dtr school. However, unless the author of 2 Ki 23:13 fabricated Josiah's activities and the traditions behind the existence of foreign cult places, we can assume that Solomon did at least build a *bmh* or an altar.[31] There is certainly some tradition behind the pericopes. Whether or not it is accurately recorded is debatable but it is likely that the details were supplied to the Dtr writer.[32]

The Israelites did know of a goddess Astarte and at one time Solomon was said to have worshipped her. In no case was she conceived of as an indigenous deity, rather she was an import from Phoenicia *via* one of Solomon's political marriages.[33] It is not likely, though an argument *ab silentio*, that a Phoenician cult of Astarte was widespread in Israel and Judah. During Josiah's reform (2 Ki 23:12) *ᶜštrt* is mentioned only in connection with the *bmh* which Solomon built. Of course we do not know to what deity the priests were burning incense (2 Ki 23:5,8) but *ᶜštrt* was not specifically named. At the time of Solomon, if the verses reflect a real situation, Sidonian Astarte was not known to have been an astral deity. The ᶜAštôret of the *OT* is specifically Phoenician as Chemosh is Moabite and Molech Ammonite. Probably she should not be confused or equated with any other goddess named or not.[34]

ᶜštrwt

The other *ᶜštrt*'s in the *OT* are found in the plural form and there is no good reason to equate them with the ^{c}Aštōret of 1 and 2 Kings. Most critics[35] agree that *^{c}štrwt* is a general term for the goddesses of Canaan as in Mesopotamia *ištarātu* and *ilāni* denoted goddesses and gods.[36] The term *ištaratu* for "goddess" was used from the Old Babylonian period.[37] Some have suggested, on the basis of *LXX* (for Ju 3:7; 2 Sa 7:3,4; 12:10) and some Hebrew manuscripts that *^{c}štrwt* and *'šrh* are interchangeable terms for "goddesses."[38] This is, as we shall see, not a tenable thesis. The contexts in which the two are found are distinct and seem to have arisen from different sources. The two words fill very different functions in the Hebrew lexicon.

The word *^{c}štrwt* appears in Ju 2:13; 10:6; 1 Sa 7:3,4; 12:10. It is possible and probable that the *'šrwt* of Ju 3:7 should be read *^{c}štrwt*.[39] To try to determine anything about the nature of an *^{c}štrwt* on the basis of six references is most difficult and tenuous, especially as the word appears in one, or possibly two formulaic expressions. These expressions, unlike those containing the instructions to destroy cult furniture and places of pagan worship, are not nearly as stable or numerous.[40] There is, however, a possible key into the origin (within the *OT*) and development of the expression(s) which contain the word *^{c}štrwt*. The word will be studied in its complete textual environment including all the lexical items which are associated with it and all the phrases which are formulaic and are either found with the word, or are in one way or another, derivative or considered its sources.

The basic work on the isolation of Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic phraseology has been set forth. All who have dealt with the expressions to be studied here have isolated the same phrases as particular to one document or another (most basically J,E,D, or P).

Genesis 35:1-4 relates Jacob/Israel's preparation for the journey to Bethel. In verse 2 the author narrates and quotes Jacob: "Put aside the foreign gods that are among you..."

hśrw 't 'lhy hnkr 'šr btkkm

The verb śwr, in H-stem is used to mean "put aside" or "put out of use." The 'lhy hnkr are the "strange gods" or "foreign gods." Most critics agree this pericope is early, probably E.

Joshua 24 employs the same expressions. He too tells Israel (verse 2) that there will be a new beginning and that before this time the ancestors "served other gods," wy^{c}bdw 'lhym 'ḥrym. The Israelites are told (verse 14): "put aside the gods that your fathers served... and serve Yahweh:"

hśyrw 't-'lhym 'šr ^{c}bdw 'bwtykm...w^{c}bdw 't-yhwh

The people protest saying in verse 16 that they would never consider "worshipping other gods:"

l^{c}bd 'lhym 'ḥrym.

Joshua, in verse 20, offers a prediction of what will happen if they do "...forsake Yahweh and serve foreign gods:"

t^{c}zbw 't-yhwh w^{c}bdtm 'lhy nkr.

Finally in verse 23 they are told again: "Now put aside the foreign gods which you have amongst you and incline your hearts to Yahweh the god of Israel:"

w^{c}th hśyrw 't-'lhy hnkr bqrbkm wnṭw 't lbbkm 'l yh wh 'lhy ysr'l

In this long pericope the gods of the forefathers are called "other gods," 'lhym 'ḥrym in verses 2, 14, 15, 16. They are also called "foreign gods," 'lhy nkr in verses 20 and 23. Are the two terms synonymous? Verse 23 superficially repeats 14, in both cases the people are told to worship

Yahweh alone and to put aside, *śwr*, the other gods. In verse 16 the "other gods" are the gods of the fathers. In verse 20 the "foreign gods" are those of the land into which Israel will enter and then possess. It is most likely that the two terms are synonymous and were alternated for stylistic reasons. Both "other" and "foreign" gods can be "put aside." The idea of choice of worship, as Soggin[41] points out, is old (Ex 20:1ff //Dt 5:7ff) but certainly persists in Dt and Dtr literature of the pre-exilic and exilic periods. Verses 23-24 relate the act of putting away the idols(?).[42] Despite the contention commonly held that Joshua 24 records ancient and authentic traditions there is a strong Dtr overlay and editing which appears inseparable from the earlier strands.[43]

'lhy nkr has a rather small distribution in the *OT*. Apart from the verses mentioned above the term is found in 1 Sa 7:3; Dt 31:16; 32: 12 (as *'l nkr*); Ps 81:10 and Jer 5:19 (both *'l nkr*, singular) and Ju 10:16.

Dt 31 is Moses' farewell address and final instructions to Joshua. In verse 16 Yahweh tells Moses of his vision of a future Israel: "...this people will rise and whore after the strange gods of the land where they are going amongst them, they will forsake me..."

wqm h^{c}m hzh wznh 'ḥry 'lhy nkr-h'rṣ 'šr hw b'-šmh bq̣rbw w^{c}zbtym

Israel will "whore after the strange gods," *znh 'ḥry 'lhy nkr*.[44] When they do this Yahweh will forsake Israel and evil will befall them because, verse 18, they worshipped "other gods" *'lhym 'ḥrym*. Dt 31 like Josh 24 (and Gen 35) is said to belong to source E. In each case Israel is designated to be a future apostate of Yahweh who will either destory Israel or hide from her in time of need. The context of both is a covenant ceremony. Gen 35:1ff is very similar in content. Though Yahweh has not yet been chosen and named, the "one who appeared" is to take precedence over all others. There is no curse invoked for apostasy.

Ju 10:16a is very similar to Josh 24:23, 1 Sa 7:3 and Gen 35:2 in vocabulary and syntax. Burney[45] states that Ju 10:6-16 was originally part of E's history of the Judges which was incorporated by the redactor of J and E into a composite and then used by the redactor of E^2 in place of or in combination with his ordinary brief formulae. How much of the work originally belonged to E and how much should be ascribed to the main editor, he concedes, is not known.[46] Driver[47] attributes the verse to the Dtr compiler. Boling[48] attributes the pericope 6-16 to the 7th century Deuteronomic framework. The final composition may be Dtr. The "other/foreign" gods aren't named until 1 Sa 7:3,4. The list of nations in the text, verse 12, corresponds to no other list.[49]

1 Sa 7:3,4 follows in part, the pattern established by the above pericopes. Samuel tells Israel that if they are indeed contrite and return to Yahweh they should, "... put aside the foreign gods from amongst you and the ^{c}Aštarot ..."

hśyrw 't-'lhy hnkr mtwkkm wh^{c}štrwt

In response (verse 4), "the Israelites put aside the Ba^{c}alim and the ^{c}Aštarot and served only Yahweh."

wyśyrw bny ysr'l 't-hb^{c}lym w't-h^{c}štrwt wy^{c}bdw 't-yhwh lbdw

The "foreign gods" *'lhy nkr* must be "put aside" *śwr*, if Israel is to be saved from the Philistine oppressors. Instead of the future prophecy of apostasy as in Dt 31 and Jos 24, the actions have already taken place and Israel is in the straits predicted in Dt 31:18 and Jos 24:20. Samuel tells Israel that if they want help they had best return to Yahweh.

Kittel[50] suggested, on the basis of verse 4, inserting *bᶜlym* in place of *'lhy nkr*. By comparison with the format set forth in Dt 31, Jos 24 and Ju 10:16 it seems more likely that *ᶜštrwt* is out of place. The verse is closest to Ju 10:16 in that the people are told to "serve," *ᶜbd*, Yahweh while Jos 24:23 they must "incline," *nṭh*, their hearts. In verse 4, the *bᶜlym* are used as a synonym for *'lhy nkr*. The choices at hand are that either the author of 1 Sa 7:3,4 drew on phraseology of texts as Jos 24 and Gen 35 and incorporated it into a Dtr format with *ᶜštrwt* and *bᶜlym*, having to gloss *'lhy hnkr* in verse 4 with *bᶜlym*, or that the verse originally looked like Jos 24:23. Someone later added the *ᶜštrwt* and *bᶜlym*. Distressingly few instances of *ᶜštrwt* and *bᶜlym* together, occur in the *OT* and it is, as such, difficult to do anything but guess. While *bᶜlym* do appear in abundance in Dtr books and Chr, *ᶜštrwt* appears only in Judges and Samuel, and in 1 Kings in the singular as a specific deity.[51] While the dates of the composition of the texts are subject to debate, they are generally ascribed to one or another of the Dtr editors.[52]

The final occurances of "foreign gods" appear in Dt 32:12, Ps 81:10 (parallel with *'l zr*) and Jer 5:19 (*'l nkr* parallel to "strangers in a land that is not yours"). Ps 81 like Jos 24, Dt 31 and 1 Sa 7:3 relates Israel's history of broken promises and her sale into the hands of the enemies. Jeremiah also carries the theme of Israel's transgression and apostasies using, in verse 19 the expression of the Dtr, "to forsake Yahweh and serve other gods" (in this case "foreign gods").[53]

It appears that all pericopes using *'lhy* (or *'l*) *nkr* derive from one of the E sources: Gen 35, Jos 24 or Dt 31. The use of the expression is confined to Israel's apostasy. If Ju 10:16 and 1 Sa 7:3,4 are Dtr they are closely related to source E. Weinfeld[54] does not consider it a Dt or Dtr cliché. The fact that the expression "to put aside foreign gods" never persisted in the Dtr literature makes the assignation to that school slightly suspect though Dt 32:12, Jer 5:19 and possibly Ps 81:10 do not belong to an early strand. Thus Ju 10:16 and 1 Sa 7:3,4 could be the work of an editor of a later school.

The verb śwr in H-stem (and also G) is used throughout scripture. In the Dtr texts it is commonly used to describe the removal of the bmh.

It appears that while the format of 1 Sa 7:3,4, containing the expressions to "put aside foreign gods" has pre-Dtr antecedents, the use of ^{c}štrwt and b^{c}lym is unprecedented in that context and we should consider it a later, possibly Dtr addition.

Other verses containing the word ^{c}štrwt are, Ju 2:13; 3:7; 10:6; 1 Sa 12:10. Each of the pericopes deals with Israel's apostasy. Ju 2:11-13 is considered "the pattern of the period"[55] of Judges and fulfills the promises made in Dt 31:17 and Jos 24:20. While verse 11 mentions only the b^{c}lym, verse 13 contains both b^{c}lym and ^{c}štrwt apparently synonymous with 'lhym 'ḥrym of verse 12. Verse 13 reads: "They forsook Yahweh and served the Ba^{c}ls and the ^{c}Astartes."

wy^{c}zbw 't yhwh wy^{c}bdw lb^{c}l wl^{c}štrwt

Judges 3:5-8a is a unit which is very similar in several respects to Ex 34:11-16. It begins with a list of nations in verse 5. Except for the first three, the Canaanites, the Hittites and the Amorites, the list duplicates that of Ex 34:11[56] and is similar to Dt 7:1 which probably derives from Ex 34. Another point of similarity is its theme of intermarriage in verse 6: "They took their daughters for themselves as wives and their own daughters they gave to their sons and they served their gods."

wyqh 't bnwtyhm lhm lnšym w't-bnwtyhm ntnw lbnyhm wy^{c}bdw 't-'lhyhm

In Ex 34:16 and Dt 7:3 intermarriage is strictly prohibited. Both Ex 34 and Dt 7 contain the directive to destroy the foreign cult objects one of which is the 'šrym. It was probably at this point that the author of Ju 3:7, influenced by the word 'šrym wrote 'šrwt for ^{c}štrwt.[57] In scripture, outside of 2 Chr 19:3 and 33:3 the plural of 'šrh was written 'šrym. Only in 2 Chr 24:18 was the 'šrym served, ^{c}bd. The use of ^{c}štrwt (written 'šrwt) in this text may then, have been original as we can detect the reworking of the pericope.

Judges 10:6 begins with the same formula as in 3:12, 4:1, 13:1: "to continue to do evil in the eyes of Yahweh." They did this by "serving the b^{c}lym and the ^{c}štrwt and the gods of Aram, the gods of Sidon, the gods of Moab and the gods of the Ammonites, the Philistine gods and Yahweh they did not serve."

> wy^{c}bdw 't hb^{c}lym w't h^{c}štrwt w't 'lhy 'rm w't 'lhy sydn w't 'lhy mw'b w't 'lhy bny ^{c}mwn w't 'lhy plštym wy^{c}zbw 't yhwh wl' ^{c}bdwhw

The core of the list of nations, Moab, Sidon, Ammon, is the same as that found in 1 Ki 11:33 which describes Solomon's apostasy. Solomon's list names the gods and gives the gentilic for Sidon (Sidonians), but the Ammonites are called bny ^{c}mwn in both. Aram and Philistia are not mentioned in 1 Ki 11:33 and are somewhat puzzling here. Boling[58] attributes the passage to the Dtr school of the 7th century.

Finally 1 Sa 12:10 is contained in Samuel's farewell address which recapitulates the history of the period of the Judges and describes Israel's contrition in the face of adversity. It seems to borrow from Ju 3:5-9 and 10:6-16. Israel cried to the Lord and said: "We have sinned for we forsook Yahweh and served the Ba^{c}als and the ^{c}Aštarôt, but now save us...and we will serve you."

> *ḥṭ'nw ky ^{c}zbnw 't-yhwh wn^{c}bd 't hb^{c}lym w't h^{c}štrwt w^{c}th hsylnw...wn^{c}bdk*

Ex 20:3-5 (//Dt 5:9) contains admonitions against worshipping gods other than Yahweh. They are warned to make neither idols nor images nor to bow down to them or serve them. Further in Ex 23:23-24, Israel is told that, of the peoples whom Yahweh is about the drive out of the land, they shall not bow down to nor worship their gods; Israel should destroy the works and break the *mṣbwt*. The "other gods," *'lhym 'hrym*, are the gods of the peoples of Canaan. To these gods Israel will not bow *hštḥwh*, nor serve, *^{c}bd*. The expression, "to bow down to and serve other gods," becomes very popular in subsequent literature.[59] This expression is sometimes combined with the phrase "to forsake Yahweh/Israel forsook Yahweh" *^{c}bd 't yhwh*, in Judges and Samuel. It seems that the expression discussed above, "foreign gods," was not popular and was not retained while "other gods" gained wide usage in the Dt and Dtr literature, possibly derived from certain legal texts. The narrative literature (Gen 35, Jos 24, Dt 31) reflects a situation in which the peoples have "other gods" which they can put aside. The legal codes tell Israel that henceforth they should not serve or worship "other gods."

Israel's apostasy is expressed in several phrases which contain elements of the verses given above:

1. *^{c}bd 'lhym 'ḥrym*
   to serve other gods
2. *hlk 'ḥry 'lhym 'ḥrym w^{c}bdm*
   to go after other gods and serve them
3. *hlk ^{c}bd 'lhym 'ḥrym*
   go and serve other gods
4. *hštḥwh l'lhym 'ḥrym w^{c}bdm/l^{c}bd 'lhym 'ḥrym whštḥwh lhm*
   to bow down to other gods and serve them/to serve other gods and bow to them

The first expression is found earliest in the JE injunctions of Ex 23:24 and 20:5. These laws may well be the background to the Dt and Dtr expressions which describe Israel's sin as the service of other gods. All subsequent expressions are a reworking of that idea. Dtr usually expressed the worship of "other gods" in more explicit terms than did Dt. Dt never mentions Ba^{c}al or any other god of a foreign country or people by name. It is only in the Dtr texts, those pericopes and books derived from them, the prophets and some JE texts, that Ba^{c}al is mentioned by name. Dt also does not know ^{c}Aštarôt except as a place name and perhaps idiomatically to mean "increase." Thus, while Dt derives many of its expressions from E and the pre-Dt schools it uses only the most innocuous terms. That Dt mentioned the *'šrym* at all would indicate that the word had no god-related meaning.

The Priestly texts do not use any of the derived expressions. *^{c}bd* is never used in P[60] to describe service to foreign gods.[61] It means either physical labor as in Egyptian servitude (Ex 14:12) or more frequently to describe the performance of the physical duties associated with the care and transport of the tabernacle and tent. The expression closest to those of Dt and Dtr is Lev 26:1 which prohibits the manufacture of images and prostrating before them. Dt and Dtr show a real predilection for the use of *^{c}bd* for "worship" either pagan or for Israel's cult. P neither influenced nor was influenced by the expressions which contain the word *^{c}štrwt*. Given the proliferation of the expressions built on *^{c}bd 'lhym 'ḥrym* and their durability it is curious that an exilic P did not know them.

Those texts which contain both *^{c}štrwt* and *b^{c}lym* belong to the expressions "to put aside the foreign gods." *^{c}štrwt* and *b^{c}lym* are substituted for by "foreign gods." They could also have been fit into the expression *^{c}bd 'lhym 'ḥrym* substituting *^{c}štrwt* and *b^{c}lym* for "other gods."

There are in addition, expressions including only *b^{c}l* or *b^{c}lym*. All of the occurances with *b^{c}l(ym)*alone are Dtr. 2 Ki 11:15 specifies names of gods, instead of "other gods" or *b^{c}lym*. It also uses the proper name ^{c}Aštôret instead of generic *^{c}štrwt*. It seems the redactor of the text knew the earlier texts which specifically mentioned ^{c}Aštôret as the goddess whom Solomon worshipped. In setting Solomon's sin the Dtr framework the editor substituted the real names of the gods and goddess for the standard expression "other gods" or *b^{c}lym*.

The use of *^{c}štrwt* in expressions of apostasy is limited to the books of Judges and I Samuel (and possibly I Ki II). The use of *b^{c}lym* is more widespread and overlaps that of *^{c}štrwt*. The problem at hand is placing the expressions using both words in some textual source in order to understand the genesis of the expression and how the words entered the Hebrew lexicon. Clearly either the editors of Kings and Judges-Samuel were unaware of each other (which is possible) and they drew on different sources of literary expressions, or the texts bearing our terms are earlier or later than Dtr. If earlier, the expressions bearing *^{c}štrwt* must have fallen to disuetude and were forgotten or neglected by later writers. If their origin is late, there really is no reasonable explanation as to their origin or to their absence in other late books as Chronicles or some of the writing prophets. The fact that *b^{c}lym* is so popular in the expression in the later historical books and in the prophets, especially Jeremiah, and that in neither is *^{c}štrwt* mentioned is puzzling; one might suspect an early date for the use of the term. On the other hand, its restricted usage makes it difficult to determine the date of its incorporation into the literature.

It is difficult to explain "to serve the *b^{c}lym* and *^{c}štrwt*" as a late expression since it does not appear in late texts outside the supposedly late texts of Judges and Samuel. It could of course be understood as a variant of "to serve the *b^{c}lym*" since Ju 2:21 and 13, and 10:6 and 10 contain both. If the expression were confined to passages of early composition we would then explain the absence in later texts. Neither explanation is wholly satisfactory and the most reasonable conclusion would be that these formulae are simply the products of a particular school in the Dtr tradition, which produced the edited books of Judges and 1 Samuel. This is probably best illustrated by 1 Sa 7:3 which, in outline, bears many similarities to the E traditions of Jos 24, Gen 35 and Dt 31. The same might be said for Ju 3:5-8 which bears the substructure of the E (or J) pericope of Ex 34:11-16. 1 Sa 12:10 is an obvious copy of the framework of Judges. The affinity of the pericopes for E texts is their most striking feature though none of the critics attribute the sections to an E source and most favor the Dtr editorial hand as creator of the expressions.[62]

In 1 Sa 7:3,4 and Ju 10:16 (and 6) the "foreign gods" or *ᶜštrwt* and *bᶜlym* are apparently idols or, based on the model of Gen 35:1-4, were seen to have been such by the later editors. They were perhaps glossing *'lhy nkr* with what gods they knew at the time. The *ᶜštrwt* and *bᶜlym* of Ju 2 and 3,(10) and 1 Sa 12:10 are then, generic names for the gods, as the Akkadian *ištarātu* and *ilāni*. Since ᶜAštôret is the only goddess mentioned in the literature of the pre-monarchal and united kingdom it is not surprising that her name was chosen. Later, under Ahab and subsequent kings the goddess Asherah appears.[63]

We suggest that the *ᶜštrwt* of Judges and 1 Samuel and 1 Kings could have been incorporated into the expressions under the influence of Solomon's apostasy in the worship of Astarte of Sidon. It is also possible that the term *ᶜštrwt* was borrowed from the Assyrian *ištarātu*, though this would be a late development and the texts containing the word, though not of early composition, are describing a period which would have to be dated not later than the end of the 10th century B.C.

1 Sa 31:10 (=1 Chr 10:10)

The final notice for *ᶜštrwt* in the *OT* occurs in 1 Sa 31:10 which describes the aftermath of Saul's defeat by the Philistines at Gilboa. In that pericope in verse 9, the Philistines are said to have cut off Saul's head and removed his weapons and then sent the announcement to the land of the Philistines. In verse 10 they then placed Saul's weapons in the house of Astarte, *byt ^{c}štrwt*, and tacked his body to the walls of Beth-Shan.

1 Chr 10:9-10 describes the same events. In this case the weapons were sent about the land to inform the idols and the people. The weapons were then placed in the house of their gods, *byt 'lhyhm*, and Saul's head was fastened to the house of Dagon, *byt dgn*.

We know from other Biblical sources and archaeological corroboration that the Philistines settled on the Southern coast of Palestine and they worshipped the god Dagon (Ju 16:23). 1 Chr 10:9-10 is consistent with some of what we know was true of Philistine religion. We do not know that the Philistines worshipped Astarte, nor is there sure evidence that the Philistines actually settled in Beth-Shan or the Jezreel Valley.

The two pericopes do not make a clear distinction whether, in the case of 1 Kings, the signs of Israel's defeat were sent around Philistia which included the area of Beth-Shan or the signs were sent to Philistia (on the coast) and returned to the Canaanite city of Beth Shan. For 1 Chr it appears that the head and weapons were removed and sent about Philistia and were kept there. However, in both books, men from Jabesh Gilead (to be located East of the Jordan some distance from Philistia) removed the bodies for proper burial.

For the most part it has been assumed that the Philistines occupied Beth Shan; this was based on the reference in 1 Kings and the discovery of anthropoid coffins at the site and associated with Philistines. In recent years, with continued excavations and a better understanding of the Philistine cultural complex, the theories of Philistine penetration into the hill country have been modified.

While many[64] consider the anthropoid coffins together with some certain pottery types[65] (none of which are typically Philistine) sufficient evidence to posit a Philistine presence at Beth-Shan, others[66] will admit to an Egyptian garrison but not to actual Philistines as we might know them from the time of Saul and David. The coffins are generally assigned to level VI or the reign of Rameses III.[67] None of the associated pottery was of "Philistine" ware and, further, any connection between "Philistine" ware and the anthropoid coffins at any site is very tenuous.[68] While the pottery is generally found in the coastal areas the coffins tend to be located inland and extend South into Egypt and Nubia. They are an Egyptian artifact whereas the pottery called "Philistine" derives from Aegean prototypes.[69]

The connection between the Philistine peoples and their material remains was sought in the Egyptian Medinat Habu wall paintings and inscriptions of Rameses III in which he records his defeat and subsequent settling of the Sea Peoples. Quite possibly those mercenaries stationed by Rameses III at Beth-Shan adopted the burial practices of the Egyptians. While it is possible the mercenaries were Philistines it is not a given and the evidence for such a contention is slim.[70] It should also be noted that the absence or presence of "Philistine" ware is not diagnostic. As a luxury ware it penetrated, through commerce, areas where the Philistines, if they did make and market the ware, may never have stopped and settled. We might also ask if the "Philistine" mercenaries of c. 1150 B.C. were the ancestors to the Philistines at Beth-Shan some 100 years or more later.

F. James,[71] in reviewing the Iron Age levels at Beth Shan wrote:

> (There is) no archaeological evidence of Philistines at Beth-Shan but there need be no doubt that the Israelites did fight there. According to the Old Testament Israel never seems to have fought the Philistines of the Pentapolis as far North as Beth-Shan except at Gilboa. Probably the Philistines united with Canaanites at Beth-Shan against Israel. After they won at Gilboa the coalition exposed Saul's body on the walls of Beth-Shan and sent the armor back to Philistia. This would explain the difference in 1 Ch 10:8-12 and 1 S 31:8-13.

T. Dothan[72] counters James' analysis of the pottery remains:

> ...that by late level VI (second half of the eleventh century, corresponding to the internment of the "grotesque" coffins) Philistine pottery was already degenerate and assimilated into local ware. This seems to bring us nearer in date to the Biblical references to Beth-Shan. The pottery fits in well with the Canaanite-Philistine level at Megiddo VIA and level X at Tell Qasile, both of which were probably destroyed by King David.

The coffins, she continues, appeared before the Philistines in the 13th century, probably with Egyptian mercenaries. The subsequent appearance and change of style in the 12th century at Beth-Shan, Tell el-Farah (South) and Nebesheh (Tanis) coincides, then with the arrival of the Philistine mercenaries settled by Rameses III. To sum up, Dothan posits two stages in the use of the anthropoid coffins, the first of Egyptian origin and used by Egyptians, the second, exemplified by the application of new features on the coffins, used by Philistines in the employ of Egypt and contemporary with the events recorded in 1 Sa 31 and 1 Chr 10.

We are still left though with several vexing questions: the sudden adoption of Egyptian burial rights by the newly arrived Philistines is out of keeping with usually conservative burial practices of most ancient (and modern) peoples and the lack of Philistine ware at Beth-Shan. Or, if the lack is due to waning of the type and assimilation into local Canaanite styles how can we say they were once "Philistine"? There are also no typically Philistine figurines at Beth-Shan[73] or any material which we can compare with the finds from Ashdod and other known Philistine sites.

While the question remains unanswered as to who was living at Beth-Shan and more specifically who dedicated the temple to Astarte in 1 Kings 31, this verse is the only one in the OT for which we can say with assurance that a goddess named Astarte was worshipped. Since she is never associated wtih Philistines outside this passage, it is logical to assume the goddess and the temple to be Canaanite and located at Beth-Shan. At any rate, by the late 11th century, the Philistines had assimilated Canaanite religious practices and had adopted several Canaanite gods.

It has often been suggested that the laying of the weapons of the enemy in the temple of Astarte was a sign that Astarte was a war goddess.[74] In the Egyptian materials from the 18th dynasty and later, Astarte is depicted as a war goddess.[75] We know that the Egyptians worshipped Mekal at Beth-Shan[76] during the reign of Tutmosis III, and Anat later during the reign of Rameses III.[77] We do not know if Astarte was worshipped by the Egyptians at Beth-Shan. It is most likely she was and would have been revered by the Egyptians as they knew her from the cult of Egypt (regardless of its ultimate origin), as a war goddess. On the other hand, she did not have to be particularly war-like to receive the weapons, just pre-eminent.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. Dt 1:4; Jos 9:10, 12:4, 13:12, 31.

2. 1 Ch 6:56; 11:44.

3. EA texts 197:10 and 256:21. Knudtzon, *Die El Amarna Tafeln*.

4. Y. Aharoni, *Land of the Bible*, 128-129.

5. Cf. M. Astour, "Place Names," in *RSP* II, p. 314. Aharoni, op. cit., 128-129.

6. Aharoni, op. cit., p. 97.

7. Clemen, C. "Die phönikische Religion nach Philo von Byblos," *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatisch-ägyptische Gesellschaft* XLII pt. III (1939) p. 29.

8. Dossin, G., "Les Inscriptions des Statues de Mari," *CRAIBL* (1953). Pp. 241-242. In pre-Sargonic levels of the Temple of Ištar.

9. Garstang, J., *The Syrian Goddess*, 43, n. 7. More recently cf., R.A. Oden, Jr., *Studies in Lucian's de Syria Dea*. Missoula, Mont., 1977.

10. *Ugaritica* V, text 9 *verso* line 9.

11. L. Fisher, in *RSP* II, 447a.

12. Ibid., 447 *a* and *d*.

13. W. J. Fulco, *The Canaanite God Rešep*, p. 56ff.

14. Cognates to *šgr* are non-existent in the Semitic inscriptions, though it appears in Arabic, Akkadian and late Hebrew. In *Targum*, Dt 28:21, *šaggar* means "to give birth" or "to cast" (as animals bear offspring). P contains the only other occurance of *šgr* in the *OT* in Ex 12:13. This is considered a gloss by some. In Akk. the root means "locked or enclosure" hence, "cage." While the pl. *ištarātu* and *ᶜštrwt* do mean "goddesses" is this the meaning intended in Dt and does this really help explain *šgr*?

15. Delcor, M., "Astarte et la fecondite des Trompeaux en Deut. 7,13 et Paralleles," *UF* 6, 1974, 7 ff.

16. Hillers, D., *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets*, 1964. Gevirtz, Stanley. "West Semitic Curses and the Problem of the Origins of Hebrew Law," *VT* XI, passim.

17. *ANET* p. 108.

18. Weinfeld, M. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, Oxford, 1972. 311 n. 1 (from Langdon, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*, 108).

19. Delcor, op. cit., pp. 11 and 12.

20. Ibid., pp. 12-13.

21. M. Pope, in *WdM*, p. 250.

22. 1 Ki 11:5; 11:33; 2 Ki 23:13.

23. Hermann, "Aštart," *MIO* 15 (1969) n. 57. Sidon as head of Phoenician cities means generally Phoenicia. (Cf. Ju 18:28; 2 Sa 24:6; Gen 49:23; Is 23:24.) The gods of the Sidonians and Astarte of the Sidonians would be translated more accurately, "the Phoenician Gods" and "Phoenician Astarte." It is interesting that Tyre was rebuilt towards the end of the 13th cent. or the beginning of the 12th by the Sidonians. By the end of the period of the Judges, Tyre became preeminent and remained so for some 500-600 years. It was known though as a Sidonian city. Albright, *CAH* 51, p. 36 writes: "Thence forth from Sidon's rebuilding of Tyre at the end of the 12th cent. until the late 8th cent. B.C. we find "Sidonian" used in the Bible, the Homeric epics, and native inscriptions as a term covering the South Phoenicians in general. Ithoba^{c}al I of Tyre (c. 887-856) appears in the Bible as "King of Sidonians..." It is also possible that the term arose after the fall of Tyre to Nebuchadnezzer in 574 and Sidon regained its former status. Cf. forthcoming book by P. Bikai, *The Pottery of Tyre*.

24. Cf. infra Ch. 1 note 44. If *bmh* is Moabite and Astarte were worshipped in a manner similar to her male counterpart Astar we might find a connection between Solomon's cult installation of the *bmh* and his service to Astarte. For a full bibliography of the Mesha Stone cf. Gibson, vol. 1, 71-83.

25. For the use of *'lhym* as "goddess" see Phoe. *CIS* Ii4.

26. Fohrer, G. *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 231; Driver, S.R. *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 191f; Noth, M. *Könige*, 241.

27. Weinfeld, op. cit. App. A for specific pericopes, passim.

28. Ibid., p. 333, v A 6.

29. Ibid., pp. 320-321.

30. Driver, S. R. *Introduction* p. 191 ff, still valid and useful.

31. On the bamah--an altar or high place? Cf. Vaughan, P. *The Meaning of the 'Bāmâ' in the Old Testament*. 1974.

32. It is of course possible that the details of the traditions

reflected in the Josianic reform were supplied by the Dtr. While it may have been true that Solomon did erect cult places for various gods the names were lost and contemporary cultures and deities filled in. To be sure, the name of the Egyptian deity worshipped by the Egyptian princess is no longer remembered while those of the other wives are enumerated. This would certainly place the entire pericope(s) in the hands of later redactors.

33. Solomon, like the later Ahab, is not charged with initiating the process of worshipping foreign gods. They are condemned for the practices but their wives are held responsible for turning them to the gods. I Ki 11:4-6 tells that the foreign women whom Solomon loved turned *nṭh* his heart from Yahweh and, presumably, influenced him to worship Astarte and build cult places for the worship of other gods. Ahab too, though thoroughly corrupt according to the editor of Kings, and idolatrous, was given a final remission. In I Ki 21:25, Ahab was evil, but his wife, Jezebel lured or incited him to do what he did. She, like Eve and Solomon's wives, are held by the writers of the *OT* to be ultimately responsible for the sins of disobedience and idolatry. (Cf. also II Ki 9:18. Jehoram who followed in Ahab's footsteps couldn't help himself because his wife was the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel.) These women, and in addition, Maacha and Athaliah (another Sidonian/Israelite) are responsible for the only mention in the OT of the worship of the goddesses Ašerah and Astarte. These are goddesses supposedly foreign to Israel. They belong to the Phoenician sphere. (Solomon did not limit himself to Phoenician women and deities but worshipped those of all his wives. Astarte seems to be remembered by name in II Ki 23. Ahab was particularly fond of Baal who was probably the Phoenician Baal and consort of either Astarte or Aṯirat or both.) All other pagan worship or impure Yahweh worship runs like a thread through the historical books of the *OT*. The *'šrym* and *ᶜštrwt* cannot be seen in the same light as Jezebel's Ašerah and Solomon's wife's (and his) *ᶜštrt*.

34. Jeremiah (44:17-19; 7:18) mentions a "Queen of Heaven" whom the women worshipped and for whom they baked little cakes. There is no solid evidence to equate this goddess with Astarte. Several goddeses in the ancient literature are called Queen of Heaven, most notably Anat and Ištar.

35. Driver, G.R. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, 63. J. Gray, *Joshua, Judges and Ruth*, 256. Hermann, "Astart" op. cit. Plessis, J., *Istar*..., T. S. Frymer, in *EJ*, v. 3, Pope, *WdM*, 250.

36. Plessis, op. cit., passim. *CAD* vol. i/j.

37. *CAD* ibid., 271-273.. *Ištaru* written syllabically and ideographically to mean "goddess." The plural *iš-ta-ra-at* is attested in OB texts. Ištar is also used as generic *ištar ṣeri*, "a goddess of the field" and *ištar ša ekalli*, "a goddess of the palace."

38. Plessis, op. cit., p. 183. Based on some confusing readings of several EA letters. W. R. Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*, 189 n.

1. "The goddess Asherah in the Bible was born of a confusion between the goddess Astarte and the sacred pole asherah."

39. In 2MSS Hebrew and the Vulgate read *ᶜaštarôt*. The other two instances of *'ašerôt* are II Ch 19:3 and 33:3. These *'ašerôt* are objects made by man to be placed by or erected on or near an altar. They should not be equated with *ᶜaštarôt*.

40. Cf. infra Ch. 1.

41. J. A. Soggin, *Joshua*, 236.

42. Nielson, "The Burial of the Gods...," *Studia Theologica*, 8 (1955), 103-122. Cf. also Othmar Keel "Das Vergraben der Fremden Götter in Genesis 35:4b." *VT* 23 (1973).

43. Soggin, op. cit., 228.

44. *Znh 'ḥry* is restricted to E in this religious context.

45. Burney, op. cit., 294.

46. Ibid., xli.

47. Driver, S.R. *Introduction*, p. 167.

48. Boling, op. cit., 30. Ju 2:6-23; 3:1-6 belong to the earlier 8th cent. Pragmatic collection.

49. Ibid., 1972-193. Cf. infra Ch. 1 p. 15.

50. Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica* 3d ed.

51. Cf. above pp. 106-108.

52. A. Weiser, *Samuel...*, 1-24; Weinfeld, op. cit., 334.

53. Ju 10:6, 10, 13.

54. Op. cit., passim.

55. Boling, op. cit., 30, 75f; Burney, *Book of Judges*, passim.

56. Verse 5 follows a list of nations in verse 3 which has only one member in common, Canaan.

57. For discussion see Ch. 1, infra.

58. Boling, op. cit., 30.

59. Weinfeld, op. cit. 320-321.

60. Milgrom, J., *Studies in Levitical Terminology*, sections 55-57.

61. *'lhy 'hrym* are found primarily in Dt (18 times) and Dtr and Jeremiah (18 times) in covenant or legal contexts. The expression apparently means "extra" or "other,""alien" or "enemy."

62. Weinfeld, op. cit., derives the expression from "to serve other gods" p. 320.

63. This name is to be distinguished from the *'šrym* which were some type of cult place or cult standard representing a site.

64. Dothan, T. "Anthropoid Clay Coffins from a Late Bronze Age Cemetery Near Deir el-Balah," *IEJ* 23 (1973) 3, p. 144.

65. Amiran, R., *Ancient Pottery of the Holy Land*, p. 277-283.

66. Todd, S. A., "The Philistines" passim.

67. High chronology 1196-1168; low chronology 1170-1139.

68. At only one site, Tell el-Farah (South) do they appear together in tombs 552 and 562.

69. Dothan, T., *The Philistines and their Material Culture*. Jerusalem. passim.

70. Dothan, T., see above note 64.

71. James, F., *The Iron Age at Beth-Shan: A Study of Levels VI-IV*, 136-138. See also E. Oren, *The Northern Cemetery of Beth-Shan*, 1973, 139-150.

72. In *IEJ* 23. p. 144-145.

73. Pritchard, J. B., *Palestinian Figurines in Relation to Certain Goddesses Known Through Literature*. passim. Cf. also the Ashdod Reports of M. Dothan, "Ashdod-Seven Seasons of Excavation," *Qadmoniot* 17 (1972).

74. Borger, R., "Die Inschrifiten Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien," *AfO Beiheft* 9 (1956), 107-109. *ANET* 533-534. Astarte is called upon to break weapons in battle. She was considered Phoenician as opposed to Assyrian or Aramaean. Albright, *YGC*, p. 226-8. Hermann, "Astart," p. 26. Pope, *WdM* p. 251.

75. See excursus on Astarte in Egypt.

76. Rowe, A. *Topography*, 1930 I, 14-15; Pl. 33.

77. Ibid., 32-33; Pl. 50 no. 2.

Chapter IV

ASTARTE AT UGARIT

A discussion of the Ugaritic materials according to genre, will be the most productive method for determining the actual role Astarte played in the religious life, both official and popular, of the community at Ras Shamra.[1] The distribution of Astarte in the texts will show that she was probably a native of the West Semitic world but not as important to the general population as she was to the royal household. Peculiar discrepancies in her appearance in the literature may be explained by historical or political motives. The problems will be briefly outlined and then described more fully below.

The goddess is of considerable rank in the pantheon lists. Though she does not occupy the top position in the lists she is not included with the secondary deities. She was also not felt, at least in the lists, to be a foreign goddess.[2] In a parallel Akkadian list, Hebat is the only goddess included in the section of foreign deities; it lacks the Ugaritic correspondence.

Astarte appears frequently in sacrificial and offeratory lists where she is alloted small animals. There is good indication that an active cult was dedicated to her. She or her functionaries were alloted certain clothing and perhaps monies for her upkeep or that of her retainers. In none of the lists was she identified or paired with any other deity.

On the other hand, she is peculiarly absent or non-descript in both the mythological texts and the epics and the personal names of the inhabitants of Ugarit. One could almost assume that Astarte, while revered in the official cult was not yet taken into the mythology--she stood somehow outside the literature. Conversely, she could well have been pushed aside by a stronger diety such as Anat. We know of Astarte's unique importance in Egypt where her function as guardian of horses, chariots, and kings is well defined. Her appearance in the *OT* and her name as a place name attests to some degree of antiquity and status in Syro-Palestine. Her later importance in Phoenician texts shows an increased rather than diminishing stature when compared with her status in Ugaritic texts.

In the alphabetic texts from Ugarit *ᶜṯtrt* is not found in the onomastica. The masculine *ᶜṯtr* does occur in a few texts.[3] The Hurrian counterpart to Mesopotamian Ištar, *šaušga*, appears twice[4] while Ištar is absent from the onomastica of Akkadian texts from Ugarit.

Offering Texts: UT 22, 23, 1004, 1088, RS 24.643

ᶜṯtrt appears frequently in the Ugaritic offering lists (UT 1004:3, 18, 19; 19:16 (=CTA 39); 28:14 (=CTA 38); 22:6 (=CTA 37); RS 24.643:7). Though called "offering lists," in most cases any ritual that may have been involved is not known or understood. In fact the designation is such because deities are named with what we consider to be sacrificial animals or gifts.

Texts 22 and 23 are similar. *ᶜṯtrt*, *'lt*, *pdr* and *ll* are mentioned in both. In text 23:4 one *š* is offered to *ᶜṯtrt*. It is possible but not likely that the offering follows the deity's name. In such case one (?) *ᶜšr* would be *ᶜṯtrt*'s offering. Any ritual or directions which may follow are unintelligible.[5] According to Levin's[6] schema we should expect for line 4: "male of the flock to !aširat [sic]." Lines 5 and 6 of text 23: ṯṯ. ş[in] (6) tšnpn ^{c}lm. km[m], then describe a ritual to be performed with the six "small cattle."[7] Neither text indicates that the sacrifices or offerings were performed according to any calendar though 22:8, wbṯlṯ ş[in], may be a date.[8] If ^{c}ṯtrt does occur three times in 23 (lines 1, 3, and 4) these may be three different ^{c}ṯtrt's or she is given offerings at three separate stages of the ritual or on separate calendar occasions.

Text 1004 is very fragmentary; the entire right side is gone. Line three may bear the word ^{c}ṯtrt. On the verso, lines 18 and 19 read:

18. l. ^{c}ṯtrt . ndrg
19. l. ^{c}ṯtrt . abḏr

These are two local manifestations of the goddess: the Astarte of ndrg and the Astarte of abḏr.[9] The meaning of the texts and the location of the towns remains enigmatic.

RS 24.643 is written in alphabetic cuneiform with lines 13-17 in alphabetic Hurrian. Part of the text, lines 1-9, notes offerings to various deities. This text contains most of the gods of the canonical list of Ugaritic deities.[10] Lines 10-12 are a list of šlmm offerings for ilib and a god of şpn[11] and a long list of b^{c}lm kmm.[12] The verso contains another list of offerings to certain gods.[13] Lines 18-22 are a series of offerings or tithes[14] to be made on a ritual occasion. In the first part of the text, (line 7) ^{c}ṯtrt receives a š. Apparently the offerings were to be made at a festival of the dbḥ şpn. De Moor[15] believes this text to be the description of the ritual told in mythic form (or *vice versa*) in UT 67:IV (=CTA 5:VI). The sacrifice of Ṣapanu, he says, took place in the Spring, probably at the end of April, during the course of which Astarte-of-the-field was carried about in a procession. As a mirror of the myth, he continues,[16] Astarte goes roaming about the countryside looking for Ba^{c}l. The only connection I can see between the two texts is that in both *spn* is mentioned. I am not convinced that Ba^{c}l receives more offerings or sacrifices than any of the other gods,[17] it would seem rather that *^{c}ṯtrt* is the major recipient.

UT 19 (=CTA 39) might be another offering list to deities but is more likely a tally of places which receive allocations. Astour[18] equates *^{c}ṯtrt* with *gt ^{c}ṯtrt* of UT 170:6. It is one of the cities belonging to Ugarit and is possibly Aštarot of Dt 1:4[19] located in Bashan.

UT 1088 (lines 1-4) lists money payments to shrines (?) or temples of certain gods.[20] Gordon[21] reconstructs the missing letter of lines 2 and 3 and reads:

2. [ṯ] mn . l . ^{c}šrm [bt] . ^{c}ṯtrt
3. tlṯ. ^{c}šrh . [b]t . ršp . gn
4. arb^c . bd . b[n] . uš[t/r!]yn

bt. ^{c}ṯtrt and *bt. ršp* would be translated "the house of Astarte" and "the house of Rešep." Another possible reconstruction, in keeping with UT 170:6 would read *(g)t ^{c}ṯtrt* and *(g)t ršp*. *gt ^{c}ṯtrt* is known from the Akkadian texts and discussed by Astour.[22]

UT 1091 also details wine allocations for or from guilds or individuals. *^{c}ṯtrt* here appears to be a place name though all the titles with the exception of *^{c}ṯtrt* in line 10, and *ḫty* in line 9, are guilds or professions. The destroyed portion of the text may have contained a title or professional designation for them as well. Since we know of a cult devoted to Astarte we can assume there were personnel devoted to her who worked in the temples or were attached by guild membership.

UT 2158 ennumerates deities with domesticated animals. The only deities whose names we can read with certainty are *b^{c}l* and *^{c}ṯtrt* in lines 3 and 6. The relevant lines read:

3. alp. pr. b^{c}l . [	ox, young bull, Ba^{c}l
4. wprt . tkt .[	and a cow ...
5. šnt . [	sleep(?)[23]

6. s̀s̀w . ^{c}ṯtrt . ws̀s̀w . ^{c}[	horses, Astarte, and horses ^{c}...
7. wht (?) . [ ] k. s̀s̀w(?)rym	...

Virolleaud[24] interprets the tablet to be a dream omen text. Astarte is here associated with horses which are never offerings and are only rarely mentioned in texts from Ugarit.[25] If Anat is correctly reconstructed at the end of line 6 this would fit well with her association with Astarte in Egypt, though she is not primarily linked with horses and chariots.[26] Unfortunately there is no precedent for Astarte's association with horses in the Semitic world.

Ritual Texts: UT 5(=CTA 33); 2004; RS 24.643

UT 5, 2004 and UG V text 9 (=RS24.643) all describe rituals in which *^{c}ṯtrt* is named. 2004 and 24.643 might be instructions for the festival of *dbḥ ṣpn*.[27] In all three texts a phrase appears which describes the arrival of *^{c}ṯtrt* at the palace.

UT 2004:10-11

10. k. t^{c}rb . ^{c}ṯtrt . šd . bt (m)lk

11. k . t^{c}rbn . ršpm . bt . mlk

UT 5:1-2

1. kt^{c}rb . ^{c}ṯtrt . ḫr (--)

2. bt mlk . ^{c}šr . ^{c}šr . (--). bt ilm

RS 24. 643:18

18. kt^{c}rb . ^{c}ṯtrt . šd . bt . mlk

^{c}ṯtrt šd and ^{c}ṯtrt ḫr

In text 2004 and 24.643 *^{c}ṯtrt*'s epithet is *šd*, in UT 5 it is *ḫr*. Gordon[28] translates *ḫr* as "cavern" or "cave." She is "*^{c}ṯtrt* of the cave." De Moor[29] translates *ḫr* (-) as "Hurri," apparently the Hurrian Ištar. Astour[30] concurs with de Moor saying, "... in the syllabic texts of Ras Shamra it appears as the epithet of Ištar of Hurri (alphabetic text ^{c}ṯtrt UT 5:1?) i.e. probably Ištar of Nineveh a national deity of Hurri-Mitanni...whose cult was also taken over by the Hittites." He also equates this name with Išḫara. There is no good argument against considering *^{c}ṯtrt ḫr* as the Hurrian Ištar. The same name is found in Akkadian syllabic texts from Ugarit.[31] We will have to determine if Ištar and Astarte can be equated in certain contexts.

^{c}ṯtrt šd is generally translated as "Astarte-of-the-field."[32] I am not convinced that *^{c}ttrt šd* should have a war-like connotation. *šd* in Ugaritic literature has two definite meanings: 1. a measured field or a measure of land, perhaps borrowed from the Akkadian[33] and, 2. cultivated or arable land. The majority of citations for *šd* are lists of lands either belonging to or granted to individuals.[34] In

the epic and mythic literature, reference to *šd* is usually made in connection with agriculture[35] either the lack of fertility or blessings or reference to the cultivation and plowing of fields. There is no text for which we can definitely say *šd* is a battle field. If de Moor is correct in his analysis of UT 2004 (and he also includes 24.252 and probably should also cite 24.643) as the recitation of ritual requirements for the autumnal New Year's festival, a *^{c}ṯtrt* of a fertile field would be entirely appropriate.[36]

The Akkadian equivalent to *^{c}ṯtrt šd*, Astarte-of-the field, is *Ištar ṣēri*. This name also appears in the syllabic cuneiform tablets from Ugarit.[37] In two texts she is invoked as witness to juridicial proceedings.[38] Are the Ištars of Ḫurri and *EDIN* (=*ṣēri*) the same as *^{c}ṯtrt ḫr(-)* and *^{c}ṯtrt šd* and if so why are they used in the same contexts in UT 5, 2004 and 24.643? If *Ištar ṣēri* is a war goddess is *^{c}ṯtrt šd*?[39] Or is she the gracious lady of the field come to visit the palace on the occasion of the New Year's Festival?

kt^{c}rb in 2004, 5, and 24.643

The meaning of the lines quoted above is not clear. Most translate *kt^{c}rb* as, "when x comes up" or, "when x arrives at."[40] UT 5, lines 23-26, bears a description of a ritual in which the king goes to take the gods, perhaps from their place, seven times for each deity.[41]

23. mlk . ylk . lqḥ . ilm
24. aṯr . ilm . ylk . p^{c}nm
25. mlk . p^{c}nm . yl[k]
26. šb^c . pamt . lklhm

It is not known whether lines 23-26 are related to the lines above describing the bringing of the gods to the *bt mlk* or relate a separate ceremony. No similar instructions are given in either 2004 or 24.643.

The pantheon in UT 5 is by no means the usual one. In addition to *^{c}ṯtrt ḫr* the deities *ušpġt*, *kṯr*, *gtr*, *špš*, *yrḫ*, *^{c}nt(h/m?)*[42] are mentioned several times in the text.

UT 2004:1-2 give some indication that the text described a sacrifice given by a king in which quantities of wine, ennumerated on the *verso* of the tablet with the cities of their manufacture(?), were to be brought or consumed.

De Moor[43] describes the tablet as a leaflet from the notebook of a temple administrator. It deals with an aspect of the New Year's Festival which is the *dbḥ ṣpn*, the "sacrificial banquet of Ṣapanu." The *dbḥ b^{c}l* of line 14, he says, belongs to the same New Year's and wine festival.[44] He translates lines 9-15:

9. (a)rs
10. k. t^{c}rb . ^{c}ṯtrt šd bt . (m)lk
11. k . t^{c}rbn . ršpm . bt . mlk
12. hlu . dg
13. ḥdṯm
14. dbḥ . b^{c}l . k . tdd . b^{c}lt . bhtm

9. a fir tree
10. When Astarte of the Field enters the house of the king
11. When the Rašpuma enter the house of the king
12. A woollen garment, a fish.
13. At the new moon
14. The sacrificial banquet of Ba^{c}la when the Mistress of

the mansion chases...[45]

Nowhere does he mention the role or special place of *ᶜṯtrt* or *ršpm* in these texts or in the rituals. Was *ᶜṯtrt šd* associated with the grape harvest?[46]

The text accompanying (lines 18-22) the phrase "when Astarte of the field comes to the house of the king" in 24.643 is a list of items to be devoted to Astarte at the time she is brought to the palace. The list includes clothing (?), riders(?) or a type of conveyance, oils scents and perhaps, honey.[47] On the *verso* of the tablet are offerings to other deities. Line 9 might read *ᶜṯtrt* with a *š*. The list of gods, like that of UT 5, is not the "official" pantheon list. They are minor deities seldom mentioned in the literature. Astarte's position is near the middle of the list.

The question remains, what were the rituals described in UT 5, 2004, and RS 24.643? De Moor's suggestion that these texts are all dealing with the visit by the gods to the royal palace is reasonable.[48] In UT 5:5-6 the deity is given *ṯlṯt . mzn drk*, "provisions for the journey of three days." Does the king go personally to fetch the gods in lines 23-26?

In a Hittite text[49] the goddess Ištar is sent for by the king and provisioned for the journey. We also know that in Mesopotamia the gods were paraded about the cities and brought to the king's palace.[50] Once a year Adad-Nirari I brought Assur to the palace to sit upon the dais built for him. Tukulti-Ninurta I cursed the future ruler who would prevent the gods from entering his new palace on festive occasions.[51] Van Driel[52] mentions that the sight of a travelling god must have been fairly common. If such practices occurred in the Hittite world as well as in Mesopotamia there is no reason to assume the kingdom of Ugarit to have been different. How the practice came to be adopted at Ugarit, if it was, is a separate problem.

What is curious about these texts is that Astarte appears in all of them as the one who comes to the palace. In UT 5 line 9 the *gtrm* also come up; in 2004 the *ršpm* enter.[53] It is possible that *gtrm* are related to Akkadian *gašeru* "strong," as of a god's horns and could be an epithet of Ba^{c}l.[54] In the case at hand we have a possible plural. It is also conceivable that the *^{c}ttrt* in the text is a plural like the *ršpm* of 2004 and the *gtrm* of UT 5 though we would expect the verb in that case to read *t^{c}rbn*.[55]

The Hurrian section of RS 24.643 has not yet been successfully translated. Larôche[56] has normalized some of the alphabetic Hurrian to syllabic cuneiform but the text remains unclear. Line 17 bears the name Šaušga who is equated with *^{c}ṯtrt*.[57] RS 24.643 is not a coherent unit but probably five separate sacrificial, dedicatory or ritual directions. *^{c}ṯtrt* appears in only two of the five sections: line 7 as noted above is a list of offerings to many gods, and lines 18-22 relates the coming of the goddess to the palace. She is given clothing and gifts.

We can only speculate about the nature of the texts. The component parts of UT 5 and 2004 are minimally: sacrifice to/on/ of *ṣpn*, offerings to other deities, and the arrival of *gtrm* (UT 5) or *ršpm* (UT 2004). De Moor[58] says of 2004, "Whether or not his [the king's] kingship, like that of Ba^{c}lu, was re-affirmed every New Year cannot be inferred from the available sources." We know, though, from Mesopotamian sources, that the sacred marriage was performed yearly between the king and Inanna/Ištar.[59] Inanna/Ištar was also the deity who bestowed kingship upon an individual. It is possible that our three texts record the ritual instructions for the renewal of kingship at Ugarit. Astarte ḫr and šd would then be close equivalents for Ištar.

UT 2008

In one Ugaritic letter, UT 2008,[60] we find the name Astarte. An official at alty wrote to the king of Ugarit, possibly Niqmadu II[61] concerning shipping and trade. The sender invoked the following gods,

7. l. špš . ilm . l . ^{c}ṯtrt
8. l . ^{c}nt . l . kl . il . alṯ[y]

on behalf of nmry (Amenophis III?). It is not clear whether špš, ^{c}ṯtrt and ^{c}nt are to be included with "all the gods of alty," but if so the letter represents early evidence of ^{c}ṯtrt's movement from the mainland to the Island (if indeed alty is Cyprus) which was to become important to the later Phoenicians. This is the only Ugaritic letter in which gods are invoked by name.

In several of the texts[62] Astarte's name is without epithet, or if one existed it is now destroyed. In UT 1004 on the verso ^{c}ṯtrt has two epithets or geographical designators: ndrg and abdr. She is ^{c}ṯtrt ḫr, the Hurrian Astarte,[63] and in two similar texts[64] she is ^{c}ṯtrt šd. In the first section of RS 24.643 ^{c}ṯtrt appears alone in a list of gods and offerings. In the third section she is the object of a ritual. While the ritual's functions and origins are not understood, only ^{c}ṯtrt ršpm and g̱trm participate.

Clearly there was an organized cult centered about one or several Astartes. The problem in analyzing the texts is the diversity of epithets and the question of whether we have one or more Astartes. In texts UT 5, 2004 and RS 24.643 *^{c}ṯtrt*'s epithets have Akkadian (Babylonian) equivalents and a possible Egyptian parallel.[65] The spelling of the goddess's name in syllabic cuneiform demonstrates no clear distinction between Ištar and Astarte. We would need to know about the local manifestations of Ištar or Astarte in order to determine if it were significant that at times Ištar is written *ESDAR* and at other times *INANNA*.[66] I assume Ištar and Astarte were considered distinct deities but in the Ugaritic texts delineation is not always clear.

It is reasonable that there would have been a purely local Astarte as well as those worshipped by foreigners and the royal household at Ugarit.[67] Do those texts in which Astarte appears without epithet describe rituals for a local Astarte cult?

Epics and Myths

Keret

Astarte appears rarely in the Epic and Mythological texts from Ugarit. In the Keret epic (UT Krt=CTA 14 and UT 127=CTA 16) she has little role. In *Krt*: 146 and 293 the beauty of the bride-to-be, *ḫry*, is compared to that of *^{c}nt* and *^{c}ṯtrt*. They are the epitome of beauty.

145.	dkn^{c}m . ^{c}nt	whose grace is as the grace of Anat,
146.	n^{c}mh. km . tsm	whose beauty is as
147.	^{c}ṯtrt tsmh	the beauty of Astarte.

The same comparison is made in lines 291-293. These are followed by descriptions of *ḫry*'s eyes which are like gems, and her girdle of *trml*.

Astarte's name and attributes fill out a couplet in which Anat is the first mentioned.

The two adjectives, *n^{c}m* and *tsm* form a pair in Ugaritic literary texts. *tsm*, from the root *ysm*, and *n^{c}m*, are paired in several of the Anat texts: UT 49:2:19-20, UT 67:6:5-6 and 28-29, UT 76:2:19, UT 76:3:19.[68] They also appear in UT 2 Aqhat 2:41-42 and UT 62:1-2.[69] In all the above texts except the Keret epic, the noun or adjective *ysmsmt* or *ysmm* or *ysmt*, is coupled with the appropriate form of *n^{c}m*. Nevertheless, based on the number of occurances of *ysm* with *n^{c}m* we can safely state that the pair was a fixed pair and was used in a somewhat altered form in Keret. In the Anat cycle the land, *arṣ*, is usually the object described whereas in Keret it is *ḫry*, the daughter of *pbl*. She is destined to be the progenitress of the royal family.[70] In only three of the 14 entries for *ysm*[71] is there no parallel of *n^{c}m*. Anat is called *n^{c}m* in only one other text[72] and Astarte is never again called *tsm*. The goddesses' names in the Keret epic were used to hold the description of the fair and beautiful *ḫry*. The descriptive pair existed in the repertory of the ancient poet's "clichés" or stereotypic expressions. To use the pair of nouns the poet chose another established pair, Anat and Astarte.[73] In no case should the use of *^{c}ṯtrt* in these lines be considered a reflection of the importance of the goddess except, perhaps negatively; her name was used in a cliché.

^{c}ṯtrt šm b^{c}l

Most translators have rendered *^{c}ṯtrt šm b^{c}l*,[74] "^{c}Aṯtart-name-of-Baal,"[75] though "^{c}Aṯtart-of-the-heavens-of-Baal" has also been suggested.[76] Comparison with later Phoenician and Punic inscriptions in which a similar expression, *pn b^{c}l*, as an epithet of *tnt*, favors the former translation.[77] *^{c}ṯtrt* as hypostasis (name) of Baal is a preferred translation but with what aspect of Baal is she identified? She plays a very small role beside Baal in the Ugaritic texts. Gray[78] suggested the epithet proves her functions as a fertility goddess but the evidence is too ambiguous to extract such a conclusion. The section in question reads:

54.	... yṯbr	... break
55.	ḥrn. ybn . yṯbr . ḥrn	Ḥoron. O Son! May Ḥoron break
56.	rišk . ^{c}ṯtrt . šm . b^{c}l	your head and Astarte-Name-of Ba^{c}l
57.	qdqdk...	your pate...

It is a couplet of familiar composition. The couplets are composed of parallel strophes which are synonymous. In the preceding lines 50-53, *ysb* the crown prince criticizes Keret's ability to rule and tells him to step down. In line 51 sickness, *aḫt*, and disease, *anšt*, are paired. Kingship, *mlk*, and sovereignty, *drdr*, are paired in lines 52 and 53. Keret replies to his son's demands with the powerful curse of 54-57 which invokes the god *ḥrn* and the goddess *^{c}ṯtrt šm b^{c}l*, to destroy the lad before his time. Ḥoron had some power over disease, plague, healing and perhaps the underworld through identification with *ršp*.[79] That Keret called upon this god to strike *ysb*, who has just accused him of infirmity to the point of incompetence, is entirely fitting. Though there is no precedent for the supposition, it is possible that *^{c}ṯtrt šm b^{c}l* was equated with *ḥrn*. If Astarte acted in the name of Baal or as one of his aspects, for instance the avenger, this would parallel some of Ḥoron's activity.

The curse was a formulaic expression, as we can see from its use, with minor modifications, in UT 137:7-9 (=CTA 2). ^{c}ttrt does not appear in Ugaritic texts as a healing goddess or as a particularly destructive force though in several tablets as RS 24.258 and UT 2001 her actions are open to such an interpretation. W. Hermann[80] sees in the curse one of Astarte's basic functions, that of preserving justice and order among men and the gods. Ḥoron and Astarte would then be those who uphold the rights of King Keret in the presence of a rebellious son.[81] There is no precedent for Ḥoron let alone Astarte. There is no evidence in Ugaritic texts, save ^{c}ṯtrt's intercession in UT 137:40 and the rebuke (?) of 68:28-29, that she is concerned with justice at all. The fact that her name is formed with Baal's in a curse, and a violent one at that, indicates that the aspect of Baal with which she is identified is more warlike than peaceable.

In the Keret texts Astarte is beautiful and she is invoked in a curse. In both cases the expression appears to be a formulaic phrase into which any number of names could be fit. The major deities in the text are Aṯirat, El and Baal, who play active roles in the legend. Astarte and Anat are rather marginal in the text and their names could have been substituted for others.

The problem of dating the legend is impossible though some have tried.[82] The possibility that it was copied an untold number of times could mean that it was also altered to conform to contemporary religious and political preferences and influences. If such was the case, Astarte would have played a greater or lesser role in some earlier version. We do not know then if she was in ascendance or decline.

UT 137 and UT 68 (=CTA 2 III AB, i and 2 III AB, iv)

Astarte plays a small role in these two texts which are part of the Anat cycle. Yam, in UT 127:9 is a major deity who has his own house. If the order of the texts is as reconstructed by Gordon,[83] Baal in UT 137 vies with Yam for his throne and Yam then sends emissaries to the assembly of the gods to protest Baal's actions. In lines 6-9 Baal(?) curses Yam:

6. brišk . aymr [
7. ṯpṭ . nhr . yṯb[r . ḥrn ...]
8. rišk . ^{c}ṯtrt . [šm . b^{c}l . qdqdk ...]
9. (--)t . mt . tpln . bg[bl ---]

6. On your head *aymr* [on your pate]
7. Judge River. May [Ḥoron break]
8. your head, and Astarte-[name-of-Baal your pate]
9. [... May] fall in Gubla---

The curse has already been discussed with reference to the Keret epic above.[84] The addressee in Keret is *ybn*, "O Son!," while in UT 137 it is *ṯpṭ nhr*, Judge River, an epithet of Yam. In this case Baal threatens Yam with the weapons created by Koṯar-wa-Ḫasis (68:10-15) and which destroy Yam later in the same text. Later, in 137, Baal enraged with the messengers' request that he be turned over to Yam, raises his weapons to kill them and Astarte and possibly Anat restrain him:

40. [ymnh . ^{c}n]t . tuḫd . šmalh . tuḫd . ^{c}ṯtrt ik[....
41. [ak . ym . t^{c}]dt . ṯpṭ . nhr . mlak . mṭḫr . yḥb[
42. [ ] mlak . bn . ktpm . rgm . b^{c}lh . wy[

The text is damaged in part and reconstruction is difficult in several places. Partial reconstruction is based on CTA 2. Gordon's translation[85] makes Astarte the ally of Yam in protecting his emissaries from Baal's rage. Hermann[86] interprets this, as he does her actions in the Keret epic in a social/political context wherein the messengers are protected as guests. Gray[87] agrees but also sees Astarte as an ally of Baal in UT 68, 129 and 137. Perhaps if Yam were the tyrant of UT 68:30 they feared repraisals if the messengers were harmed. Surely Anat, if her name is correctly reconstructed, was an ally of Baal and her name in parallel construction with Astarte would necessarily imply Astarte's sympathy with Baal.

Finally in UT 68:24-27, Baal succeeds in destroying Yam. The translation of lines 28-30 is controversial. I quote a few attempts.

28. bšm . tg^{c}rm . ^{c}ṯtrt . bṯ laliyn.[b^{c}l]
29. bṯ . lrkb ^{c}rpt . kšbyn . zb [l . ym.k(?)]
30. šbyn . ṯpṭ . nhr . wyṣa . b[ ]

Gordon[88] translates the section as a rebuke of Baal for killing their captor(!):

By name, Astarte rebukes:
Shame, O Aliyn Baal,
Shame, O Aliyn Baal
Shame, O rider of Clouds!
For Prince Sea was our captor.
For Judge River was our captor.

John Gray[89] translates:

Exultantly ^{c}ṯtrt cries out
Scatter him, O mighty Baal
Scatter him, O thou who mountest the clouds
For Prince Sea had held us captive
He held us captive even Judge Nahar

Ginsberg:[90]

For Shame, O Puissant (Baal)
For Shame, O Rider of the Clouds

For our captive is Prince Yam
Our captive is Judge Nahar

Hermann[91] seems to agree with Gray:

Beim Durchboren(?) schrie Astart: "Zerschmettere(?)
    o Alijan Ba(al)
zerschmettere(?), o auf Wolken Einherfahrender,
    den gefangengesetzt hat mich der Fur(st Yam).

de Moor[92] reads:

^{c}A$\underline{t}$tartu rebuked the Name
Be Ashamed, o Ba^{c}lu Almighty!
Be ashamed, o Rider on the Clouds!
For his Highness Yammu is our captive,
For Judge Naharu is our captive!

Astarte is either for Baal or against him. If the assembly of gods is with Yam (137:22-26, 36-38) should not also Astarte? Gordon's translation does not make much sense. If Yam were the captor why would Astarte chastize the liberator? Ginsberg and de Moor[93] base their translation on the idea that captives should not be harmed, but there is no indication that Yam was held captive nor, for that matter, his emissaries. Though Gray's[94] translation uses difficult and otherwise unattested etymologies or those not suggested by others, the meaning of his translation seems consistent with the text and with what we know of Yam and Baal. If Yam were the captor to whom the gods had to pay tribute and revere, Astarte's joy at his death would be expected. Hermann's[95] translation hints that Astarte herself had a personal reason for wanting Yam out of the way. He cites the Egyptian story of Astarte and the Sea in which she is "given"(?) to the Sea as ransom.[96] In UT 68, then, she would be praising her liberator. This is the only text in the Anat and Baal cycle in which Astarte plays an active role and it is lamentably enigmatic.

RS 24.244 and RS 24.255

RS 24.244, the "serpent" text, has been studied by the most competent of scholars.[97] It consists of thirteen sections the first eleven of which repeat a single expression in which *pḥlt* addresses her mother *špš* and then gives the name of a god or goddess and his/her place of residence. The final two strophes, 12 and 13, relate a scene between *pḥlt* and *ḥrn* in which *ḥrn* is, perhaps, afflicted, cured and then apparently marries *pḥlt*.[98] Of concern here is the appearance of *^{c}ṯtrt* in several lines. In Strophe I the supreme god El is invoked and his abode is given as *mbk nhrm b^{c}dt. thmtm*, "the confluence of the rivers in the gathering of the two oceans."[99] Thereafter follow *b^{c}l*, *dgn* and in Strophe IV *^{c}nt . w . ^{c}ṯtrt inbbh*.[100] In the margin after Strophe VI there is a note which reads:

1. aṯr ršp ^{c}ṯtrt
2. ^{c}m ^{c}ṯtrt. mrh
3. mnt. nṯk . nḫš.

This is generally interpreted to mean:

1. after ršp insert Astarte
2. Unto Astarte in Mari[101]
3. is the incantation for the bite of the serpent.

The eighth strophe reads: *mlk ^{c}ṯtrth*, "*mlk* in ^{c}Aṯtarat."[102] One must assume on the basis of context that *^{c}ṯtrth* of VIII like *ttlh* (III), *inbbh* (IV), *lrgth* (V), *bbth* (VI), *ḥryth* (VII) *kpth* (IX), *šmmh* (X), and *mṣdh* (XI), is a place name and the official residence of the deity(ies) mentioned. The insert after IV gives Astarte by herself at Mari(?).

The pairing of Anat and Astarte in Strophe IV is problematic on several counts. It is fashionable to suggest a compound deity, *^{c}nt w ^{c}ṯtrt*, as we know to be the case for *kṯr w ḫss*of Strophe IX. On the other hand in this text there are several combinations which are not so clearly compound deities: *ṯṯ w kmṯ* (VII), and *šḫr w šlm* (X). *šḫr w šlm* are twin deities.[103] *ṯṯ w kmṯ* remain obscure.[104] Since we have *^{c}ṯtrt* by herself in the "footnote" we might assume that *^{c}nt w ^{c}ṯtrt* was a single deity.[105] However, outside this text *inbb* is never the residence of *^{c}ṯtrt*, though she has other epithets which might well be place names.[106]

It is true that *kṯr w ḫss* is a compound name but, to my knowledge we never find *ḫss* alone as the god's name. We do know of a god *šlm* and it is possible that *šḫr* was a god in his own right. Anat and Astarte also can stand separately and do frequently. It would seem that there are two types of compound names for gods, those in which an epithet (as *ḫss* and *qdš*) together with the name forms a compound noun but remains a single name, and those in which logically linked names, as *šlm w šḫr* (two ends of the spectrum) and *^{c}nt w ^{c}ttrt* are drawn together but not merged. They have affinity but are not equated.

The text is peculiar in its scope of gods and areas listed. Mari, as pointed out by Astour and others[107] played no significant role after Hammurapi's conquest in the middle of the 18th century B.C. He feels that the text is of Babylonian origin[108] though there is no proof. Other Akkadian apotropaic texts have been found among the fragments at Ugarit.[109]

RS 24.251 is another apotropaea against snake venom similar to RS 24.244. It is badly damaged but many of the same names which appear in 24.244 can be discerned in 24.251. After *[b^{c}l. w]dgn* in line 14 we have *^{c}nt . w ^{c}ṯtrt*. No place names are given except for line 17:

mlk . b ^{c}ṯtrt   *mlk* in Aštarot

All the gods are paired save *mlk*.[110] Astour[111] and others translate the line: "Milk in Aštartu," while others[112] translate *b* to mean "beside" or "sitting with Astarte." Since all the gods are paired one would expect *mlk* to be paired with *^{c}ṯtrt* though generally male gods form pairs with other gods, and goddesses with goddesses. The normal conjunction *w* is replaced by the preposition *b*. Since *^{c}ṯtrt* already appears as Anat's partner in line 14 it is not likely she would appear again with another god. Some combinations of gods are unusual: *El* and *hrn*, *yrḫ* and *ršp*, *^{c}ṯtr* and *^{c}ṯtpr*. Again[113] we should note that these combinations are not to be taken as compound names or new gods but that two deities are logically connected in their attributes or functions.

The final possibility is that the scribe wrote *b* for *w* accidentally but there would then be no way to account for the other instances in which *mlk* and *^{c}ttrt* are connected as deity + GN as in RS 24. 244.

RS 24.252

There are two prevailing opinions regarding the translation of the following lines:

2. il . yṯb . b . ^{c}ṯtrt[114]

3. il . ṯpṭ . b hd r^{c}y . dyšr w yḏmr

The first and most widely accepted translation is:[115]

2. The god who sits with/by Astartu.

3. The god who judges with Haddu, the shepherd, who sings

and plays...

il is also read as El who sits and judges. The second, minority opinion[116] reads the lines:

2. While the Honor of El sits (enthroned) in Ashtoret
3. El rules in Edrei...

The presence of *^{c}ṯtrt* as a GN is known in Ugaritic as we have already demonstrated.[117] Cross[118] fills out line 2 with *^{c}ṯtrt*'s epithet *šd*: "El is enthroned with ^{c}Aṯtarte of the field. El sits as judge with Haddu his shepherd." The scene fits, he says the lore of Sanchuniaton who relates *Praep. Ev*. I, 10.31, that, "Astarte, the greatest goddess and Zeus Demarus and Adodos the king of the gods ruled over the country with the consent of Kronos."

The text itself concerns primarily the *rpu* and *^{c}nt* and other deities including *kṯr*, *špš*, *yrḫ*, *ilšd* who may be guests at a feast.[119] One could imagine that *^{c}ṯtrt* and *hd* were simply other guests at the drinking party, though there is a precedent for the proposition that *b ^{c}ṯtrt* is to be translated "at/in ^{c}Astarot."[120]

RS 24.258

Mythological text, RS 24.258 describes a divine banquet given by El in the palace.[121] Many scholars have discussed this interesting and controversial text.[122] The first eight lines describe the feast in which the gods are invited to eat and drink. In line 9 Astarte and Anat arrive with offerings(?) of meat for El. Astarte prepares a *nšb*[123] while Anat brings a *krp*, which is perhaps a shoulder. The two goddesses are chided by the porter. Are they chided for tardiness? This is not indicated. They are perhaps chastized for bringing an inappropriate gift.

9. ^{c}ṯtrt . w^{c}nt . ymġy
10. ^{c}ṯtrt . t^{c}db . nšb lh
11. w^{c}nt . ktp . bhm . yg^{c}r . ṯġr
12. bt . il . h!n . l m! k!lb . t^{c}dbn
13. nšb . l inr . t^{c}dbn . ktp
14. b il ab(?)h. g^{c}r.

9. Astarte and Anat arrive
10. Astarte prepares a *nšb* for him
11. and Anat a shoulder. The porter of El's house chides them:
12. Lo! for a dog you prepare
13. a *nšb*. For a cur you prepare a shoulder.
14. He chides El his father.

In line 11 the preposition *bhm* may include El along with Astarte and Anat.[124] Pope[125] interprets lines 11 and 12 to mean *klb* and *inr* refer to El as the dog or cur rather than the porter's accusation that a *nšb* and a *ktp* are fit only for a dog. I feel the latter is more appropriate to the end of the text, lines 22 and 23, in which Astarte and Anat leave in search of something. De Moor[126] has a quite different interpretation of *inr*. I feel Pope's[127] translation of *g^{c}r* as "chide" rather than "rebuke" suits the humorous nature of the text.

After the chiding, El and his guests continue to drink until El returns to his home drunk and sick. Finally, in lines 22 and 23, Astarte and Anat go hunting or roaming about.

22. ... ^{c}nt

23. w ^{c}ṯtrt tṣdn .[

22. ... Anat

23. and Astarte go roaming. [

Tsdn (root: *ṣwd*) while generally translated as "they go hunting"[128] has a much broader range of meaning, and hunting is not the first.[129] Pope[130] suggests that they go searching for a remedy for El's "comatose state." The *verso* of the tablet perhaps corroborates that conjecture. In line one Astarte and Anat are again mentioned. They have apparently returned with something for El.

1. ^{c}ṯ]trt w ^{c}nt[

2. w [?] bhm . tṯtb[ ]dh(?)

3. kmtrpa . hn n^{c}r .

1. Astarte and Anat

2. and(?) with them they bring ...

3. As if cured. Look! he stirs.

Line 3. *kmtrpa* is translated by de Moor[131] as "like the man of Rapiu," an epithet of Danilu. The context seems quite inappropriate. Pope[132] understands the word as a compound of particle *k-* plus reflexive passive participle *mtrpa*, or *k-* plus enclitic, emphatic *-ma* plus finite form *trpa*. The root would then be *rpa*, which bears on healing. The goddesses have then brought back something to help cure an ailing El. The rest of the line is difficult to translate.[133]

The remainder of the text is similar to the hippiatric texts UT 55 and 56.[134] Lines 4-6 may describe the administering of the medicines to El.

The problems of identifying the exact nature of the text, ritual, medical, mythical or satirical, are manifold.[135] The appearance of Anat and Astarte as the only named deities invited to the sacrifice is puzzling though possibly Yeraḫ is named in line four,[136] and *tkmn w šnm* two Kassite(?) gods,[137] carry the drunken El to his chambers. Are Anat and Astarte the food bearers and providers for the gods? Or do they function as nurses, having curative and healing powers?

Pairing Astarte with Anat is not unusual in the mythological texts.[138] They are not identified with one another and there is no set order for their names to appear when they are together. As we see in this text (line 9) the order is *^{c}ttrt w ^{c}nt* and in lines 22 and 23 *^{c}nt w ^{c}ttrt* while on the reverse, line 1, we find *^{c}ttrt w ^{c}nt*.[139]

Use of ṣwd in the Ugaritic Texts

The identification of Astarte and Anat as "huntresses" is found in several other texts: Astarte in 2001:2, and Anat in UT 124:10f (=CTA 22:B:10f). The meaning of *ṣwd* and its use in the Ugaritic texts is of interest to us here.

The word itself is found fairly infrequently in the literature. Thus a definition based solely on internal evidence is difficult. From comparative Semitics we can learn a great deal. Akkadian *ṣuddu*[140] means to provide with food or provisions.[141] *Ṣudû* are the travel provisions as are *ṣidītu*. The adj. *ṣa'du* describes the foraging of animals, the action of prowling about or roaming or roving about restlessly. The verb *ṣâdu*, means to prowl, make ones rounds, turn about, whirl or spin. It is said of demons, dogs and gods that they prowl about the countryside

Ṣd appears with *hlk* in parallel construction in a number of texts.[142] In most instances the verb *hlk* is construed in the Gt (with assimilation of the /h/) as *ttlk* or *itlk*. A reflexive meaning for the Gt of *hlk*[143] does not fit the context well but might give the verb a more emphatic meaning and fill out the metrics of the line. In each case both verbs are prefixed in the same PNG.[144] In the Anat cycle it is clear that *ṣd* does not mean to hunt or to lie in wait for prey. Rather it means to roam about looking for something. Anat looks for Baal on every mountain and in the earth:

UT 49:II: 15-16

15. an . itlk . waṣd . kl
16. ġr . lkbd . arṣ . kl . gb^{c}

15. I will go and I will search each
16. mountain to the midst of the earth, each hill...

UT 67:IV:25-26

25. ... ard . barṣ . ap
26. ^{c}nt . ttlk . wtṣd . kl . ġr

25. ... I shall go down into the earth. Also
26. Anat will go and search every mountain...

Baal looks for something or perhaps just a place to reside:

UT 75:I:33-35

33. wbhm . pn . b^{c}l
34. b^{c}l ytlk wyṣd
35. yḥ . pat . mdbr

33. And on them is the face of Baal.
34. Baal goes and roams.
35. He lives in the corners of the steppe-land.

The ilm n^{c}mn roam about the land, šd, and the steppe, mdbr, in search of food:

UT 52:67-68

67. ... ^{c}d . ilm . n^{c}mm . ttlkn
68. šd . tṣdn . pat . mdbr . wngš . hm . nġr

67. ... Until the gracious gods walk the
68. field, search the corners of the steppe. The guard of the sown meets them...

At the beginning of the same text there are instructions that rḥmy is to walk about or enter and roam about:[145]

UT 52:16

16. tlkm . rḥmy . wtṣd[

16. Rḥmy enters and roams about...

Astarte in text 2001[146] appears to be roaming about or hunting:

UT 2001:1-2

1. ^{c}ṯtrt . ṣwd[t
2. tlk mdbr [

1. Astarte roams about[
2. she walks the steppe[

In the Aqhat text sd occurs without hlk and means to "hunt"[147] which is men's work as it parallels to some degree mhrm, a "hero" or "soldier."[148] In other texts ṣd occurs without hlk or else parallel to ndd, also "to wander or run about."[149]

In other texts ṣd and mṣd, nouns, refer to the sacrificed animal either domesticated or wild.[150]

The verb is used in the mythological texts to mean "roam about" "prowl" or "to provide with food." We will examine below another text in which Astarte acts as the "huntress" of the gods, the one who will provide food for the gods. At this point there is no indication that she is an Artemis figure who protects the hunted as well as the hunter and who lives somewhat removed from the other gods.

I see in RS 24.258 a fairly clear use of *sd* for the goddesses *^{c}nt* and *^{c}ttrt*. In the beginning of the text they arrive with their tribute or contribution to the feast. They bring animal parts, perhaps not acceptable to the great god El. But as goddesses who live in the steppe, (*^{c}ttrt šd*?) they bring what they have found. In the latter part of the text, they go out again, this time to search for a cure for El. In both cases they bring something to El, they provide for his well-being. Whether or not they are also healing deities here remains unknown. There is no indication Anat is ever a healer. Astarte is too shadowy at Ugarit to define clearly, but in other parts of the Near East a namesake of hers, Ištar, has healing attributes.[151]

UT 2001

UT 2001 (=PRU V text 19.39) deserves considerable attention in this paper. It is the only text from Ras Shamra-Ugarit which deals primarily with the goddess Astarte or in which she is the principle character. The *verso* of the tablet seems to relate a separate story and as Astarte is not mentioned we will not deal with it. The entire right side of the tablet is broken and, although most of the vocabulary is attested and identified in other Ugaritic texts it is almost impossible to know what activities are taking place.

1. d ṯbil[
2. ^{c}ṯtrt ṣwd[t
3. tlk b mdb[r
4. tḥdṯn w hl[
5. w tglṯ thmt . ^{c}[
6. yṣi . ġlh tḥm b[
7. mrḥh l adrt [
8. tṯb ^{c}ṯtrt bġl[
9. qrẓ tšt lšmalh[
10. arbḥ ^{c}nh tši w[
11. aylt tġpy ^{c}r ^{c}n[
12. b[]r . mrḥh . ti[
13. š[]rh bm ymn t[
14. []l b^{c}l ^{c}bd[
15. ṯr abh il . tṯrm[
16. tšlḥm yrḫ ggn[
17. k[ ]mš ḫssm
18. ṣm ^{c}ṯtrt[
19. ....n.......

W. Hermann[152] uses the text to support his contention that Astarte is war-like and pugnacious. She goes hunting, returns to meet Yam who threatens her; she then prepares a meal.[153] Yam in this text, according to Hermann[154] is also called *thmt*. Virolleaud[155] makes no comments on the nature of the text though he suggests some translation.

2. *swd[t*. Here *ṣwdt*[156] appears to be a nominal form of the root

ṣ (w/y)d, "to walk or roam about," "to hunt."[157] We have seen the prefixed form on several occasions with Astarte and Anat.[158] This form of hollow verb is unattested in Ugaritic.[159] I would agree with Hermann[160] that *ṣwd[t* is a noun rather than a finite verb. In line 2, with *^{c}ṯtrt* as the antecedent of the verbal noun *swd[t*, we can translate either, "Astarte is roaming" or "Astarte, the Huntress." If we favor the latter translation, we have a new epithet for Astarte at Ugarit. This could be related to her other epithet *^{c}ṯtrt šd* though there is no evidence from Ugarit that this epithet has to do with hunting.

3. This line is similar to 74:1:34 and 52:68[161] in that a *mdbr* (common Semitic for steppe or desert) is a proper place in which to roam. One might be tempted to add *šd* after *ṣwd[t* in line 2. By comparison with other texts mentioned above we determine that she is looking for something. *Tlk* and *ṣwd[t* are parallel here as elsewhere.

4. *Tḥdṯn* comes from the root *ḥdṯ*, to renew or make new.[162] The person is 3fs and we can surmise that *^{c}ṯtrt* is still the subject. The final *-n* is probably energic.[163] As a verb, *ḥdṯ* is not very common but as a noun or adjective it has several meanings.[164] Hermann[165] reads, "sie erneuerte (sich?) und ..."

Hl- could be the beginning of several words. *Hll* is the new crescent moon.[166] As a verb it means to "rejoice or shout praise." *Hlm* is "to strike" or, as an adjective, it indicates a place that is here or "this place." One expects a noun or adjective since the previous verbs are all prefixed forms. Perhaps we can read the line "She refreshes herself and behold..."

5. *Tglṯ*: Aistleitner[167] reads "gefriern machen." De Moor[168] reconstructs the line: *glṯ thmt ᶜlyt*. He follows Rabbinic *thwm ᶜylal* "the Upper flood from which the precipitation descended and the Upper flood let fall snow."[169] He reads *glṯ* as *ṯlg* common Semitic "snow."[170] Virolleaud[171] reads *glṯ* as the fluffy boiling of the sea as a metaphor used to describe the rush of gamboling goats or sheep tumbling down a hill. This is based on Song of Songs 4:1 and 6:5. We also do not know whether *thmt*, the deeps or sea, is the subject of the verb or if *ᶜṯtrt* is doing something in the deeps. Are the deeps jelling, calming down, are they seething, or is Astarte bathing in the frothy sea?

6. *Ysi* is 3ms from *y/wṣ'*, "to go out or leave." *Ġll* is problematic. In Ugaritic we have *ġll*, "to enter or wade" and *ġly*, "to lower or be inactive." Several Arabic verbs from the root *ġll* indicate the flowing of water between trees. It can also mean the lack of water and thirst with reference to crops. It is not unreasonable to assume that, if in line 5 *thmt* are the watery deeps, in line 6 we are still hearing of the watery depths. Perhaps the pronoun *-h* refers to *thmt*'s *ġl*, that is "her *ġl* is going out." *Thm* is an "order, message or boundary."[172]

7. *Mrḫh* "her spear."[173] Does the lance or spear belong to *ᶜṯtrt* or *thmt*? *L-* in this line could have several meanings: *lâ* "not," *lū* "verily" or *la* "to or belonging to." *Adrt* indicates power or might.[174] It is either a "lady" or an adjective describing the lance which is a feminine noun. Combined with *l-* we have "is not mighty" "verily mighty" or "of the lady," "belonging to the lady." Hermann[175] trans-

lates *l-* as "against" or "towards:" "She sends her spear towards the sea." I prefer to read it "her spear is truly mighty."

8. Is the root of *ṯṯb*, *yṯb* or *ṯwb*? to sit or reside, or to return or declare? *ᶜṯtrt* is probably the antecedent of the verb. Hermann[176] tentatively translates "to sit." We know of *ġl* as a GN.[177] However, *ġl-* could be the beginning of a number of Ugaritic words.
9. *Qrẓ*[178] may be related to Hebrew *qrṣ* "to pinch or sting or nip off." However, Ugaritic has a direct cognate *qrṣ*, "to bite or sting." Since this is the only case of *qrẓ* in Ugaritic it is possible that *qrṣ* and *qrẓ* were allographs having the same meaning.[179] *Tšt* is from common Semitic *šyt*, "to set or place." Apparently Astarte sets the *qrẓ* to her left, *lšmalh*.
10. *Arbḫ* is unknown though it could be an animal.[180] The final three consonants are found in Arabic relating to camels. The remainder of the line should be read: "she lifts her eyes and..."
11. *Aylt* is common Semitic for "doe." We may have the plural here. *Tġpy*, from the root *ġpy* (Hebrew *ḥph*, "to cover") probably refers to the does who are hiding. *ᶜr* could be derived from several roots in Semitic. The word for "ass" in Akkadian is *ḫâru*, in Hebrew, *ᶜayir*, A verb meaning "to flee, escape quickly," probably as a wild ass, is also found in Hebrew *ᶜyr*. Virolleaud[181] and Hermann (in partial agreement) translate "bull" (for a reading *ṯr*) instead of *ᶜr*. Hermann's handcopy reads *ᶜr*. I fail to understand why he chooses to translate "bull" for an equally reasonable "ass." "To arouse or awaken" and "to reveal or expose," Heb. *ᶜwr*,

is also a possibility for the root. If Astarte is out hunting, "the does will hide and the asses...." If *^{c}r* is a verb from *^{c}wr*, "to arouse or awaken," the does could still be the subject of the verb, or is the final readable word *^{c}n* the subject: "they opened their eyes?" There are limitless possibilities for translating this line, none of them certain.

12. "in...her spear she grasps(?)."[182]

13. The letter missing in the first word could be, according to Hermann,[183] one of the following four as the space would allow for them alone: /g/ẓ/ḫ/^{c}/. If the missing letter were /g/, *šgrh*, "cage, kennel,"[184] or does it mean "offspring, or young?"[185] *Bm ymn t*[, perhaps, "in the right she holds." If she is hunting, either would fit. She could just as well hold the offspring or the young of a slain doe as trap for catching. A spear in the left hand and a cage in the right is reasonable.

14. Is *b^{c}l* the god or does it mean simply "to work?" *^{c}bd*, common Semitic "to honor" or "serve". Who is serving? Is it *^{c}ttrt* or *b^{c}l*? If Astarte is the actor it is the first instance in this text of a clear *qtl* form. Without the final letter, if there was one, we cannot know if Astarte serves Baal or Baal is serving another.

15. Hermann[186] suggests a scribal error for *tṯrm*. He would read *tttrm* the Š-stem of *ṯrm*, "to eat or dine." In this case "to feed or serve food." "*ṯr*, her father *il*, she feeds."

16. *tšlḥm* is the Š-stem of *lḥm*, "to eat." Apparently Astarte is feeding *yrḫ* (is this the god?) some *ggn* which may be entrails.[187]

17. This line is unintelligible.

18. Is *ṣm* from the root *ṣwm*, to fast? This hardly sounds like a fast.

The text is enigmatic. It is a descriptive narrative in which Astarte, an apparent huntress, is the protagonist. The only animal named for certain in the text is the *aylt* of line 11. Is this the prize she brought home? Lines 2 and 3 bear several words which are found together in other narratives mentioned above pages 153-156 . It is possible that in lines 4-6 Astarte is bathing or washing in the oceans and they are rising over her. Though Hermann[188] sees in these lines a battle or unfriendly meeting between the sea (*thmt*) and Astarte, I do not believe the text as it stands warrants such an interpretation. Whatever the outcome of a meeting between Astarte and the sea may have been, at the end of the text she returns with provisions and offers them to the gods. What transpires with the deeps is simply not clear.

The important feature of the text is Astarte's activity as a huntress or provender for the gods, particularly for El and Yeraḫ. This we have seen before in RS 24.268.[189] Apart from this observation and the seeming prominence of Astarte in the text no more can be realistically gleaned from the tablet.

Pantheon List: UT 17 (=CTA 29)

The Ugaritic pantheon, like the official pantheons of the rest of the polytheistic Ancient Near East, was set forth in systematized lists. One fragmentary text in alphabetic cuneiform was found at Ugarit. UT 17 lists twenty-four deities; an undetermined number of entries are lost in lacunae. The text is partially reconstructed and explicated through comparison with several syllabic cuneiform lists also found at Ras Shamra. RS 20.24,[190] the most complete of them, has proven helpful in reconstructing UT 17. Nougayrol[191] believes that 20.24 was a "translation" of UT 17 and that the lists were practical aids rather than theological documents. The Akkadian equivalents were transcriptions, literal translations and transpositions according to equivalence. Lists of the Akkadian pantheon (Babylonian), he points out, are quite different from UT 17 and 20.24.

UT 17[192]

1. il ṣpn
2. il [i]b
3. il
4. dgn
5. b^{c}[l ṣ]pn
6. b^{c}lm
7. (b^{c})lm
8. (b^{c})lm
9. (b^{c})lm
10. (b^{c})lm
11. (b^{c})lm
12. (...) wšm(š)
13. (...)

Verso:....

1. [a]rṣ
2. [u]šḫr[y]
3. [^{c}]ṯtrt

4. i[l t] ^{c}ḏr b^{c}l
5. ršp
6. ddmš
7. pḫr ilm
8. ym
9. uṯḫt
10. knr
11. mlkm
12. šlm

^{c}ṯtrt in line 3 follows *arṣ* and *ušḫry* and precedes *il t^{c}ḏr b^{c}l*. *^{c}ṯtrt* is the last goddess listed. On the *recto*, the major gods take the first ten or eleven positions. Goddesses may begin in line 11 or 12. Without doubt *aṯrt*, *^{c}nt* and *špš* were listed before *arṣ*. The Akkadian text corroborates such a supposition in giving *^{d}aš-ra-tum*, *^{d}a-na-tum*, *^{d}šamaš* before *^{d}al-la-tum* (=*arṣ*).

Line 24 of 20.24 reads *^{d}ištar$^{iš-tar}$*. The *ESDAR* sign is used and glossed with syllabic *iš-tar*. In other Akkadian pantheon lists the goddess Ištar's name is written ideographically. The *INANNA* sign is used in 17.22:21. Nougayrol[193] may be correct in suggesting 20.24 is a translation of UT 17 or one similar. There is no other explanation for writing syllabically the common *ESDAR* sign. No other names are so glossed. In an earlier publication of 20.24[194] he reads *iš-tar* as *ḫurri* though he makes no further mention of this in *UG V*. Why would a scribe gloss *ESDAR* if there were not some confusion anticipated? It is not likely *^{c}ṯtr* would be written *^{d}ESDAR* and placed with the goddesses.[195] He should be found in line 17 equivalent to *^{d}aš-ta-bi*.[196] It is possible a particular Ištar was intended. *^{c}ṯtrt ḫr*, *^{c}ṯtrt šd*, *^{c}ṯtrt ndrg* and *^{c}ṯtrt abḏr* and *^{c}ṯtrt šm b^{c}l* are all known from the Ugaritic texts. In the Akkadian text *^{d}ISTAR. EDIN* (=*Ištar ṣēri*=? *^{c}ṯtrt šd*) is written with the *INANNA* sign, Ištar ḫurri with the *ESDAR* sign. Was Ištar ḫurri intended as equivalent of Ugaritic *^{c}ṯtrt*?[197]

In the reconstructed text UT 17, the deities fall into four categories: the great gods, foreign gods or associated gods, great goddesses and secondary deities.[198] De Moor's[199] inventory of god lists has thirty-eight entries and while some are very fragmentary *^{c}ṯtrt* appears in only five: UT 17, PRU II text 4, RS 24.2444, RS 24.251 and RS 24.643. In RS 24.244 Astarte's name is given twice, once alone and once with Anat. In other texts she has epithets and GN designators, or she has no epithets. We can determine that a local Astarte was known as well as foreign Astartes. It is very likely that some of the Astartes with epitheton are Ištar goddesses.

De Moor[200] notes that "...of the canonical lists of deities only nine are missing in the myths and epics: *ars*, *wšmm*, *grm* *w(   )t*, *ušḫry*, *ilt^{c}ḏr b^{c}l*, *ddmš*, *uṯḫt*, *knr*, *mlkm* and *šlm*." These are, for the most part, the deities who immediately precede and follow *^{c}ṯtrt* in UT 17. They also appear only in the god lists (both alphabetic and syllabic) and in offering lists (or so designated by de Moor[201]). *Ršp*, *pḫr ilm* and *ym* who follow *^{c}ṯtrt* in *verso* lines 4,7, and 8, are found in other genres of literature. None of the gods on the *verso* save those just mentioned have any significant status in the mythology, epic literature or ritual texts from Ugarit. Can this text be called a "canonical list" of Ugaritic deities and if so how does one explain the discrepancies in their appearance in the literature?

Few of the deities are imports; those with foreign equivalents are normalized and this might explain the writing *^{d}ESDAR$^{\text{iš-tar}}$*. Nougayrol[202] takes the position that the pantheons of the Eastern and Western Semitic worlds are basically very similar though he admits that he has had to force the issue a bit. The fact that many of the gods of UT 17 are indeed minor does not trouble him. The position of the deities in question is not so much the problem as their absence in other texts. By the same token many prominent deities (or those most active in the mythology and epic literature) are absent from UT 17.

^{c}ttrt occupies the lowest position for goddesses. The Akkadian version gives *^{d}he-bat* on line 16 before *^{d}aš-ra-tim* of line 19 and *ršp* and *ym* lines 26 and 29 respectively. It is hard to understand the offering lists in view of the hierarchy presented in the pantheon list. Of the gods, *b^{c}l* certainly received most of the offerings but *ršp* is allocated gifts and sacrifices in many of the texts that have already been discussed in relation to Astarte.

Astarte is given many offerings, at least comparable to Aṯirat and Anat. One wonders who might Hebat's equivalent be and why she stands before the local(?) Aṯirat and Anat. By number of literary types set forth by de Moor[203] only El and Baal appear in as many types of texts as Astarte so one wonders again why her position is at the bottom of the list.

UT 17 does not seem to be a canonical list any more than the others which de Moor and Nougayrol mention. While it is useful that a syllabic cuneiform list exists alongside the Ugaritic the fortuitous find of a translation does not necessarily indicate a more fixed or more official list than any of the others found at Ras Shamra. Astarte's position in the list is probably accurate for the local Astarte. She stands outside the myth and epic literature in which other goddesses play prominent roles. Her pre-eminent position in many of the offering texts leads me to believe that the Astarte of these texts was either a foreign version as an Ištar, or that Astarte was being edged out by a more powerful Anat.

Summary

Astarte is mentioned in most genres of alphabetic cuneiform literature from Ugarit. Her name appears in offering texts, sacrificial texts, ritual texts, lists of deities, mythological and epic literature. The GN ^{c}*ttrt* is also paralleled extensively in extra-Ugaritic sources from Egypt, the Amorite world and the *OT*. Her name never appears in the onomastica at Ugarit.

If we assume the oldest traditions are reflected in the epic and mythological texts, Astarte was either not very important or non-existent. In the Anat and Baal cycle (UT 68 and 137) she makes a brief entry on Baal's arm and she is invoked in a curse as a hypostasis of Baal. In both texts her name could be substituted for another; she is not integral to the story.

The question of Astarte's autonomy and independence of action and form is important to the understanding of her history at Ugarit and in the West Semitic world in general. As mentioned above she appears in the mythological and epic texts with Anat. When she is in the presence of the gods, acting with the gods, or is endowed with any kind of vitality she is coupled with Anat, or in the curse of UT 137 and *Krt*, she is the hypostasis of Baal. Astarte is paired with Anat in RS 24. 244 Strophe IV, though she is also Astarte of *Mr* in the marginal note on the same text. In a similar text, RS 24.251, they are coupled: *^{c}nt . w ^{c}ṯtrt*. El's banquest, RS 24.258, again introduces Anat and Astarte as bearers of food and as huntresses. There are only two texts of mythological nature in which Astarte functions without Anat. The notice in RS 24.252 line 2, is somewhat disputed. Is Astarte a divine name or a geographical name? Though UT 2001 is deplorably broken and little can be understood, Astarte acts as a huntress without Anat.

The only case in which possibly the two are identified is RS 24.244:20, *^{c}nt . w ^{c}ṯtrt . inbb*. Text 24.251 gives all the deities in pairs thus Anat and Astarte together is not unusual. In all other texts mentioned above Astarte and Anat act together or the two form parallel parts of formulaic expressions.

In UT 2158, the dream omen text, Astarte is with a horse, *s̀s̀w*. The reconstruction of Anat with the second *s̀s̀w* is certainly possible but she is not equated with Astarte.

Pairing of deities in Ugaritic religion is not unusual as pointed out by de Moor.[204] Some of the pairs are stable; one rarely finds the individual components separated from each other as *kṯr w ḫss* and *q̌ds w amrr*. De Moor suggests[205] that the combinations were the results of "...bringing two deities who were thought to be somehow related closely together." He continues, adding that it was a process which resulted in assimilation of one of the members or the final amalgam of the two with a resulting "two-unity."[206] The conjunction w would eventually drop out. Anat and Astarte represent such a phenomenon in which in the earlier texts, though closely related, they remain separate. Finally they are joined with the w and ultimately result in the combined form Atargatis.[207] He does not explain why, in ritual texts which one assumes were contemporary with their writing, Astarte appears alone and with great frequency. Similarly in offering texts they are treated individually. If de Moor's process of assimilation is to be taken seriously the texts we know or feel comfortable in assigning to a "later" period should be consistent with the supposedly early ones. Furthermore, the pantheon lists do not indicate a merging of the two goddesses. It would seem in fact that the process may be moving in the opposite direction, Astarte, always prominent in the Ancient Near East, was shoved temporarily aside at Ugarit in favor of Anat and certain aspects of Baal. The time and the impetus for her temporary eclipse are unknown but we can posit the usual political or economic influence. It is also a possibility that while Astarte was known, and known early in the written records of the Near East, she never quite reached the coast and we are witnessing at Ugarit her slow adoption into the pantheon which would ultimately lead to her ascendance over Anat.[208]

In the mythological and epic texts Astarte is primarily connected with hunting or roaming about, or with Baal she is pugnacious as invoked in a curse, and strong, she stays(?) Baal's hand from a violent move. Clearly Anat is a violent goddess though she is also the object of Baal's sexual passion and mourns him bitterly when he is killed. It is probably safe to suggest that Astarte was initially identified with Anat's less charming aspects of war and the hunt, or Anat with hers. There is no indication save her personal beauty mentioned in the Keret epic, that Astarte was a peaceful goddess or a goddess of motherly or sexual love. She is never paired with any male deity as we find Aṯirat with El and Anat with Baal.[209]

There is of course, always the possibility that at Ugarit and in the Ugaritic texts we have nothing more than a very localized phenomenon in which Anat and Baal and Aṯirat and El took precedence over other deities more popular elsewhere.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that at Ugarit in the literature considered to be oldest, the myths and epics, Astarte is very much a shadow figure. It is even possible that her name was inserted at a later date when the story became codified in the written texts.

The ritual and offering texts give us an entirely different picture of Astarte's importance at Ugarit during the period in which presumably the rituals were performed. Her cult enjoyed considerable status at court. We may be speaking here of several Astartes not all of which were equally popular. It is risky to base conclusions on negative or even meagre evidence. However the weight of the little evidence we have from Ugarit leads us to the conclusion that Astarte was not a popular deity on the coast in the earliest periods. Her inclusion in the royal or official pantheon was late in Ugarit's history and probably enacted under foreign influence.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. Nakata, I., *Deities in the Mari Texts*, Columbia University, (unpub.Ph.D.dissertation) 1974. Cf. "Introduction" for methodology.

2. UT 17 (=CTA 55) and RS 20.24.

3. Gröndahl, *PNU*, 113-114. Dahood, M., in *ASD* 87. "From the personal names one may safely infer that the Canaanites of the 14th c. B.C. considered her androgynous and it becomes much less hazardous to conclude that the ancient Semitic invaders of Mesopotamia looked upon ^{c}Aṯtar as an androgynous deity." He refers to ^{c}*ttrt* *'b* and ^{c}*ttr 'm*. I do not think the Semites did anything of the sort. The two fill quite different functions and were not equated.

4. *PNU*, 247.

5. On *kmm* see *UG V* 9:1:11, 12; 13:11, 28; 8:43? and UT 126:4:16 (=CTA 16); 9:1:15 (=CTA 36); 3:33 (=CTA 35). Only in texts 22 and 23 do we have *'lm kmm*. The *b^{c}lm* and *kmm* of *UG V* 9:1:11 may read *b* +^{c}*lm* instead of the usual *b^{c}lm kmm*. Cf. de Moor, *Studies II*, 320. "... on the following day do the same." However, the texts de Moor and Gordon quote do not have to mean "the next day" rather, the 2d day as contrasted to the 3d (4th and 5th) days. Cf. *RSP II*, 142. He quotes RS 24.249:6 ^{c}*lm*, "in addition."

6. Levin, B., "Ugaritic Descriptive Rituals," *JCS* 17 (1963), 107 note 17.

7. Ibid., 109.

8. Cf. UT 3 and 9.

9. UT glossary 19 and 1619.

10. Astour, M., in *RSP II*, 319, reconstructs line 21 to read: *!ilt ṣpn* or the *ilt* of *ṣpn* parallel to *il ṣpn* of UT 17:2:1 (=CTA 29) Anat III:26 (=CTA 3); 603:3 and *b^{c}l spn* of UT 1:10 (=CTA 34); 9:14 etc. Not all the deities in 1004 have accompanying geographical names so one wonders if his reconstruction is valid.

11. De Moor, J., *Studies II*, lists *ilib*, *il* and *b^{c}l ṣpn*. This is conjectural.

12. See above note 5.

13. De Moor, *Studies II*, 306 note 17.

14. Ibid., 306.

15. De Moor, *AOAT* 16, 197-201.

16. Ibid., 201.

17. Ibid.

18. Astour, *RSP II*, VIII:32.

19. Cf. infra. Ch. 3, pp. 100-102.

20. Hermann, "Aštart," 33. He follows Gordon, The temples are local ones for Astarte.

21. Gordon, UT 1088.

22. Astour, *RSP II*, VIII:32, 84 b, c. He also identified *^{c}ṯtrth* of RS 24.244 line 41 as a GN known in *OT* Gen 14:5; Dt 1:4; Jos, I Chr. *contra* Caquot in *Syria* XLVI (1969).

23. Virolleaud, C., "Fragments de Tablettes du Four," *PRU* V (1965), 189.

24. Ibid., 189-190.

25. Horses are mentioned in RS 16.180; 16.285; 17.144; 17.148; 18.137; 18.140; 18.55.

26. It is tempting to use this text as evidence of Egyptian Astarte's origins on the Northwest Syrian coast. While the appearance of Astarte with horses is initially striking, the text is so mangled no clear meaning is ascertainable. See *infra*. Excursus on "Astarte in Egypt."

27. De Moor *AOAT* 16, 197-201, 79. UT 2004 is the ritual of *dbḫ ṣpn*, the autumnal New Year's festival.

28. *UL*,, 114.

29. De Moor, *Studies II*, 310, and *AOAT 16*, 131.

30. Astour, *RSP II*, VIII, 151 b, 352. Cf. F. M. Cross, "The Old Phoenician Inscription from Spain Dedicated to Hurrian Astarte," *HTR* 64 (1971), 189-195. Also M. Weippert, "Ein ugaritischer Beleg...," *ZDPV* 85 (1969), 48 note 86. He says that *^{c}ttrt hr* in *CTA* 33 (=*UT* 5) is Hurrian Ištar (=Šauška) and the same applies to Egypt.

31. PRU VI 17.410:7 reads: *eqlat ^{il}eštar hurr(i)*; *PRU* IV 18.01:3 and 6 read: *ša^{il}ištar hur-ri*; *PRU* III 16.173:8,9 reads: *u itta-din ^{il}ištar hur-ri*. *^{il}ištar* is read *ESDAR* and is also used with Hurrian Istar aš well as Istar of Zinzari and Tunip in the syllabic texts. *$^{il}{}_{2}$ištar* is read *INANNA* and is used for Ištar of Alalakh and *EDIN*=*ṣēri*.

32. De Moor, *AOAT* 16, 201.

33. Ibid., 153, and 51 note 51. Cf. Gordon UT glossary 2386.

34. UT 2026, 2029, 2031, 2090, 300 and etc.

35. UT 126:3,6, 8; 125:I:34; 52:13, 28.

36. *AOAT* 16, 79. Cf. Weinfeld, M., "Worship of Molech," *UF* 2, 147, note 110. Ašratum is called *bēlit-ṣēri*, a translation of *šd*, "Lady-of-the-field."

37. PRU IV 17.367:2 and 17.362:12.

38. Other Ištars in the Akkadian texts are Ištar of Alalakh (17. 237 and 17.340), Ištar of Zinzari (18.02), and Ištar of Tunip (18.06 and 17.459).

39. "Aštart," 19f. Cf. R. Borger, "Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Konigs von Assyrien," *AfO*, *Beiheft* 9 (1956). He states that Ištar of Arbela is a deity to grant mercy. Astarte in the list of Phoenician deities will break the bow in battle and make one crouch before the enemy.

40. *Contra* Dahood, in *ASD*, 86, who emphasizes Astarte's astral qualities (not at all apparent at Ugarit) and reads "when ^{c}ṯtrt sets." The signs following *^{c}šr. ^{c}šr* in line 2 are unintelligable ~~though~~ de Moor, *Studies II*, 310, reconstructs them to read *DU.NU alak salmi* which would mean: "give tithes (*^{c}šr. ^{c}šr*) for the coming of the statue."

41. De Moor, *AOAT* 16, 194 translates line 24: "The holy place of the gods he shall enter barefooted."

42. De Moor, *Pantheon*, 228, suggests that *^{c}ntm* "the two Anatu-goddesses proves that in spite of being a duality they (^{c}ṯtrt and ^{c}nt) were regarded as aspects of one divine being." He cites UT 5:13 (!), 18, 20 where *^{c}ṯtrt* appears quite independent of *^{c}nt*. There is no reason to suppose *^{c}ntm* incorporates *^{c}ṯtrt*.

43. De Moor, *NYCI*, 26-27.

44. De Moor *AOAT* 16, 95.

45. Ibid., 46. He equates *b^{c}lt . bhtm* with Anat.

46. In PRU IV 18.01, Ištar Ḫurri is the mistress or owner of a vineyard.

47. De Moor *Studies II*, 314, describes them as clothing.

48. Ibid., 310. Cf. Virolleaud, *CRAIBL*, 1956, p. 62.

49. Danmanville, *RHA* 70(1962) 50-61 and *RHA* 59(1956), 39-61.

50. Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien*, Bd. 2, 97, 126f, 169f.

van Driel, G., *The Cult of Assur*, 165-167.

51. Text quoted in van Driel, op. cit., 166: "Kings who constructed palaces as the everlasting seat of their majesty on the feasts of their town invited Assur my lord, and the great gods into them and slaughter sheep; these palaces are not consecrated not made as sanctuary of the gods. (He who) guilds a palace his gods enter it, and he offers the gods sheep within it. Just like the many palaces which the kings before me did not...Yearly(?) the palace of Assur, my lord and the great gods...they offer sheep before them..."

52. Ibid., 167.

53. This form of *ršp* is unattested in the NW Semitic materials outside this text. Cf. Fulco, W. J., *The Canaanite God Rešep*, 42.

54. De Moor *Studies I*, 176, "*gṯr* might be a distinct deity but probably an epithet of Ba^{c}lu but not exclusive to Ba^{c}lu." As a deity see Aistleitner, *WUS*, 711. Also von Soden *GAG*, 283. As epithet cf. Tallqvist, *St*. *Or*. 7(1938), 778. Also RS 24.252:1 where it may describe *rpi*, or in line 6, Anat.

55. Gordon, UT paragraph 9.9-15. p. 154.

56. Larôche, in *UG V*, 517.

57. RS 24.641 which lists offerings to *^{c}ṯtrt-Šaušga* Cf. Larôche, "Notes sur le panthéon hourrite de Ras Shamra," *JAOS* 88 (1968) 148-150.

58. *NYCI* pt. 1, 6.

59. Frankfort, H., *Kingship and the Gods*, 237-239, 244-246, and 185, 297-299.

60. UT 2008.

61. Hermann, "Aštart," 36.

62. UT 22, 23, 19(?) and RS 24.643.

63. UT 5.

64. UT 2004 and 24.643. Cf. also UT 1106 which is very damaged. Lines 52 and 56 bear *^{c}ṯtrt šd*. It too may be an offering list but we do not know what is being given her. *Ršp* is the only other deity mentioned in the text unless *azzlt* is goddess. As with 2004, the king is involved in providing for them or their retainers.

65. *^{c}ṯtrt ḫr*.

66. See above note 31.

67. De Moor, *Pantheon*, 187. Epithets are included only as they distinguish individual deities. "The nucleus of the Ugaritic pantheon was worshippped throughout the chapter of Ugaritic religious history that stretches from the times when the myths and epics were created to the destruction of Ugarit. Next to these many more gods were worshipped during the last two centuries of the existence of Ugarit, but it is impossible to determine how many of these were introduced into the pantheon after the date of the composition of the myths and epics." p. 224 He includes, p. 217, *ᶜṯtrt* in that nucleus.

68. =CTA 6, 5, 10 respectively.

69. =CTA 17 and 23.

70. Not an inappropriate substitute for *arṣ*.

71. *Whitaker*, 314.

72. UT 76:2:15 and perhaps UT 76:3:19.

73. The pair *ᶜnt* and *ᶜṯtrt* is fairly common, though in the ritual and offering texts they are generally joined by the conjunction *w*.

74. UT 127:56 =CTA 16, and UT 137:8=CTA 2.

75. Gordon UL, 83 and Cross, *CMHE*, 30.

76. Virolleaud, "Legende de Keret," 17-18.

77. Cf. *KAI* 14:18; Cross, *CMHE*, 30.

78. Gray, J., *The KRT Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra*, 29.

79. Pope, M., *WdM*, 288. In Egypt he is connected with Horus. Dahood, in *ASD*, 83-83, "Hauron is a virtual equivalent of Rešep, who in turn is the West-Semitic counterpart of Babylonian Nergal, the god of the plague and the underworld."

80. "Aštart," 22-24.

81. Cf. infra., "Excursus." She is protectress of the Egyptian king. Ḥoron appears in an inscription from Arslan Tash (7th c. B.C.) as one whose words are true *'š py tm*.

82. Dahood, in *ASD*, 80. Also cf. J. Gray, op. cit. 9-10.

83. *UL*, 11ff.

84. F. M. Cross in *HTR* 67(1974) pp. 9, 18. He follows Lord and Perry saying that the epithets of the deities come in various lengths to fit different metrical slots. (This would be true for any set phrase

which is expandable and contractable depending upon the length of the line.)

85. UL, 14.

86. Op. cit., 23. Also Gray, J., The Legacy of Canaan, 23.

87. Gray, Legacy, 129. Cf. van Selms, "Fire in Yammu's Palace," UF 3 (1971), 249-252. A unique interpretation. Astarte had eloped with Yam and her brother/consort ᶜAṯtar burned Yam's palace in revenge. This is the story behind UT 68, 129, 137.

88. Gordon UL, 16. Also van Zijl, in AOAT 10, 43.

89. The Legacy of Canaan, 23.

90. UgM&E, 131.

91. "Aštart," 16.

92. AOAT 16, 127. For a good review of the literature cf. p. 139.

93. Ibid., 140.

94. Bšm: Arab. root, bš, "to rejoice," with -m enclitic and bṯ Arab.: "to scatter." In Legacy of Canaan, 23. De Moor, AOAT 16, 139, notes for line 31 cites ybṯ . nn where nn if it contains a personal pronoun does not necessarily preclude its translation as be "ashamed." He reads, "ashamed at her." We could also read, "she shamed him" or "he was ashamed of it."

95. "Aštart," 16-18.

96. Gardiner, A. H. Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum, 3d series, Chester Beatty Gift, I (1935), London. Gardiner, A.H., "The Astarte Papyrus" in Studies Presented to F. Ll. Griffith, Oxford, 1932, 74-85. Gaster, T., "The Egyptian Story of Astarte and the Ugaritic Poem of Baal," in BO 1952. Cf. translation in ANET, 17-18. Hermann's position does have a certain appeal, several motifs are common to the two stories, or what we can ascertain of them.

97. M. Astour, JAOS 86(1966) 3, 277-84; JNES 27(1968), 13-36; E. Lipiński, "La Legende...," UF 6(1974); A. Caquot, "Nouveaux Documents Ougaritiens" Syria 46(1969), 241-254; Ch. Virolleaud, UG V (1969), 564-572, 574.

98. Astour, JNES 27 (1968).

99. Ibid., 16. It is interesting to note that none of the towns or residences are known coastal sites.

100. *Inbb* and *ugr* are considered residences of Anat (UT 6:9 *inbb* was a mountain). The location is unknown.

101. Astour, *JNES* 27, 21-22, *aṯr* as "after." Cf. his notes 48 and 49. Contra. Virolleaud op. cit., 574: "'(C'est) le lieu (sacré) ... de Rešep (et) ᶜAštart avec (=associés à) ᶜAštart (tournée) vers Mr." Ištar possessed one of the largest and oldest temples in Mari. Cf. Parrot, A., *Le Temple d'Istar*, Paris 1956. There are some who categorically deny the translation of *mr* as "Mari." The only argument we can give in defense of "Mari" is scholarly tradition and perhaps religious conservatism.

102. Context requires this to be a city contra. Virolleaud, op. cit., 570, "(le dieu) mlk (tourné) vers (la déesse) ᶜAštart." He bases his translation on RS 24.251:17 and RS 24.252:2 both of which he translates "...est assis à côte dé ᶜAštart." ᶜṯtrt can only be a goddess for him. Cf. also Caquot, "Nouveaux...," 246. The city is in Bashan.

103. UT 52. Home is *mdbr qdš*.

104. Astour, *JNES* 27, 20 and *JAOS* 86, 278.

105. Caquot, A., "Nouveaux Documents...," *Syria* 46 (1969), 247.

106. Infra. p. 139.

107. *JNES* 27, 29.

108. Ibid., 28.

109. Dhorme, in *Revue d'Assyriologie* 37 (1940), 83-96.

110. Cf. RS 24.244 strophe VII, *mlk ᶜṯtrth*.

111. Astour, *JNES* 27, 30-31.

112. Virolleaud, in *UG V*, 574-584. On p. 578 he compares with 24.252:2 il *yṯb b ᶜṯtrt* "Il est assis a côté de ᶜAštart." De Moor, *Studies* I, 177, reads 24.252:2 "...the god who is sitting with ᶜAṯtartu ..." as "to sit at a banquet with." He refers (p. 30) to 24.258 obv. 15. Contra. B. Margulis, in *JBL* 89, 294: "Molech son of Astarte." I read *b* as ~~"at" or~~ "in" the city of Astart with Astour who sees the solitary use of GN *ᶜṯtrt* as a means to fill out the stiche of an unpaired god. Cf. *JNES* 27, 32.

113. Infra., pp. 167-169.

114. De Moor *NYCI*, 24 reads this line: "the god who thrones with ᶜAṯtartu." Cf. p. 75 note 105, "ᶜAṯtartu...was thought to be involved in executing divine revenge."

115. De Moor, *Studies* I, 175, and *AOAT* 16, 79 and 244 note 14. S. Parker, in *UF* 4, 37 and Ch. Virolleaud, in *UG V*, 553.

116. Margulis, in *JBL* 89, 293f. Cf. Astour's comments in *RSP II*, VIII, 36 d and e.

117. Cf. above p. 132. Ug V 8:17 and 7:41.

118. *CMHE*, 21. Clemen, C., "Die phönikische Religion nach Philo von Byblos," *MVAG* XLII:3, 29. Cf. M. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts*, 47.

119. De Moor, *AOAT* 16, 79 and 244 note 14. The scene is part of the New Year's festival.

120. RS 24.244:41, RS 24.251:17. In light of Sanchuniathon it is tempting to translate with the majority opinion but until we can be certain about the activities described we will leave the lines untranslated.

121. Ch. Virolleaud, in *UG V*, 545-551.

122. Pope, M. H., "A Divine Banquet at Ugarit," in, *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays*, James Efird ed., 1972. 170-203. Margulis, B., "A New Ugaritic Farce (RS 24.258)," *UF* 2 (1970), 131-138. Dahood, M., "Ugaritic-Hebrew Syntax and Style," *UF* 1(1969), 13-36. De Moor, *Studies* I, 167-175. Ruger, H. P., "Zu RS 24.258," *UF* I (1969). Virolleaud, C., "Le Festin du Pere des dieux" *UG V*, 545-551.

123. Pope, op. cit., 182, translates *nšb* as "brisket." Margulis, op. cit., 171 also "brisket" or "breast//shoulder;" de Moor, *Studies I*, 171, some kind of meat perhaps a haunch.

124. Pope, op. cit., 182.

125. Ibid., 172.

126. *Studies* I, 171 reads *inr* in light of Hittite *innara* "on one's own account." I am inclined to agree with Pope's reading "dog or cur" parallel to *klb*. Cf. also Ruger, op. cit., 203.

127. Op. cit., 171, 172.

128. De Moor, *Studies* I, 174: of Anat in UT 124:10ff (=CTA 22: B:10ff) *km tdd ^{c}nt ṣd*. Of Astarte: UT 2001:2 *^{c}ṯtrt ṣwd[* .

129. See below pages 153-156.

130. Op. cit., 197.

131. De Moor, *Studies* I, 174, a diptotic genetive.

132. Op. cit., 197.

133. De Moor, *Studies* I, 169, reads, *hr n^{c}r*, to complete the

comparison with Danilu and the birth of Aqhat. Line 3 reads: "like the man of Rapiu the conception of the boy." Pope, op. cit., 173, 197f, is uncertain but retains hn n^{c}r. It is reference to El's ailment or to the recovery from it. I translate n^{c}r with Heb. n^{c}r "to be stirred up," "to shake up." The medicine has been administered and they exclaim over his recovery: "Look! He stirs!"

134. There is similarity in vocabulary and method of application of medicine with UT 55:16, 20.

135. Cf. Pope's notes op. cit., passim.

136. For yrh, De Moor, Studies I, 168, gives Yarihu as does Gordon UT glossary, 1151. Pope, op. cit., 179, relates yrh to Akk. rehū, "moisture." Perhaps this is the preparation of the wet gb.

137. Pope, op. cit., 194 and de Moor, Studies I, 173 notes.

138. UT 68:I:40; Krt:III:145f; VI:291; 2005:7f; RS 24.244:10; RS 24.251:14. Also see above pp. 147-148.

139. Cf. infra. Excursus on "Astarte in Egypt." De Moor, Studies I, 170 writes: "The pairing of the great goddess ^{c}Attartu and ^{c}Anatu is doubtlessly a later development in the theology of the Ugaritic priests which after the complete identification of the two and subsequent dropping of the conjunction would lead ultimately to the name of the Syrian goddess Atargatis. Here however, they are still two quite distinct goddesses..." I maintain they remain separate, Atargatis being ^{c}Attar plus Anat.

140. All references from CAD vol. 16.

141. Note the examples in CAD 16 for travel provisions for the gods.

142. Anat: 49:I:15ff; 67:VI:25ff; Baal: 75:I:34; rhmy: 52:16; ilm n^{c}mm: 52:67, 68; ^{c}ttrt: 2001:1,2.

143. UT glossary 766 and paragraph 9.33. Heb. Gt, "to go back and forth."

144. I suspect that for RS 24.258:23 we can fill in w[ttlkn] after tsdn.

145. Cf. de Moor, NYCI, pt. II, 20. He translates, "hunts" Is this Anat?

146. For full discussion see below pp. 156-162.

147. H. L. Ginsberg, in BASOR 98, p. 22 and note 66.

148. 2 Aqhat VI:39-40. Also 2 Aqhat V:36-39.

149. UT 124:10, 11. Of Anat see esp. de Moor *NYCI* pt. II, 8, *ndd* to "drive off?" The root of this word is somewhat disputed. Is it *ydd* or *dwd* from cognate to Akk. *īzuzzu*, (**dwd*)? UG V text 2 line 12: *il yṣd mlk*, meaning unknown.

150. Loewenstamm, S. E., "mṣd" in *UF* 3 (1971). De Moor, *NYCI* pt. II, 12.

151. Ištar Hurri was sent to Amenophis III to cure his illness. See Excursus on "Aštarte in Egypt" infra.

152. "Aštart," 7-55.

153. Ibid., 7-15.

154. Ibid., 16. A parallel found in 52:30. The story he compares to the Egyptian story of "Astarte and the Sea." She also appears in 69:27-30 with Anat and Baal against Yam.

155. In *PRU* V, 3-5. Cf. C. Schaeffer in *UG IV*, 75-77.

156. Reconstructed after Hermann, "Aštart," 10, and Gordon *UT* 2001. There is no other reasonable suggestion for reconstruction of that line.

157. UT glossary 2151. See above pp. 153-156.

158. Cf. above pp. 154-155.

159. The form may be qatal - *ṣawad* "roamer" or qatil - *ṣawid*. If derived from the D-stem: quttul - *ṣuwwud* or qittil - *ṣiwwid*. In Ugaritic only the G-stem is posited by Gordon, UT glossary 2151.

160. "Aštart," 10.

161. UT 75:1:34 and UT 52:68. See above pp. 154-155.

162. UT glossary 842. *WUS* 908. N-stem "be renewed or refreshed."

163. UT paragraph. 9.1.

164. It can mean "new moon" or "new." A noun formed from the *G* or *D* stems *taḥdaṯ* or *taḥdiṯ* respectively with *-n* (*-an*) could mean the "renewer" or "the one of the new moon(?)"

165. "Aštart," 8.

166. *WUS*, 832; *UT* glossary, 769.

167. *WUS*, 657.

168. *Studies I*, 183 and note 107.

169. Jastrow, M., *Dictionary*, 1648.

170. *Studies* I, 181.

171. In *CRAIBL* 1956, 60-62.

172. *WUS*, 2752 and *UT* glossary 2542.

173. *UT* glossary 1547.

174. UT glossary 92.

175. "Aštart," 11.

176. Ibid., 9.

177. UT glossary 1962.

178. /ṯ/ more properly for /ẓ/ appears in Heb. as /ṣ/. Cf. *UT* vol. I, 14 note 1.

179. Cf. UT 75 and the variation of /ẓ/ and /ṣ/ from /*ḍ/. Note *arṣ* is stable.

180. UT paragraph 8.40.

181. Op. cit., 4.

182. Grodon UT paragraph 4.8 and 9.47.

183. "Aštart," 11.

184. UT glossary 2384.

185. See above ch. 3, pp. 102-105.

186. "Aštart," 12.

187. UT glossary 599. Sometimes found parallel with *npš*.

188. "Aštart," 10. He cites several texts which he claims show that Yam is the same deity as *thmt*. Text 52 line 30 reads in part: *gp ym* and *gp thm*, "the shore of the sea, the edge of the ocean." Yam in this context does not appear as the god rather the body of water. *Thm* is singular. Anat IV D:61 reads *thmt* as the deeps. In the Anat cycle Yam the god is called *ym* and not *thm*.

189. Cf. above pp.150-51. Note also the similarity of vocabulary in line 16.

190. Nougayrol, J., in *UG V*, 42ff.

191. Ibid., 43-44.

192. Gordon lists the faces in reverse order from that in *CTA* 29. I follow *CTA* order and reconstruction.

193. Op. cit., 42ff.

194. *CRAIBL* 1957, 83. The preference of the *ESDAR* sign for *Ištar ḫurri* must have prompted his original translation.

195. The new texts from Ebla may shed light on the problem. In some preliminary reports *aš-dar-dar* was equated with an *^{d}En-te* and not with the expected Inanna or Ištar. We cannot always assume that Astarte in the West is equivalent to Eastern Ištar. The confusion felt now, appears to be only greater than the confusion illustrated by the ancient writers. There is no clear distinction between the syllabic writing of Ištar and Astarte.

196. J. Nougayrol, op. cit., 52.

197. See above note 31.

198. J. Nougayrol, op. cit., 83.

199. "Pantheon," 204-207.

200. Ibid., 222.

201. Ibid., 188-189.

202. Op. cit., 62f.

203. "Pantheon," passim.

204. "Pantheon," 277. Cf. also, *KAI: Kommentar*, 88-89.

205. "Pantheon," 277.

206. Ibid.

207. Ibid., 278. It is most likely that the combined form derives from *^{c}ṯtr* (^{c}Aštar) not *^{c}ṯtrt* (Aštart).

208. If Astarte's name is an indication of her presence we can safely assume her home to have been located in the West, in Central Syria and the area of Biblical Bashan. As a Semitic enclave or outpost on the coast, Ugarit would experience a variety of deities and adopt those more at home on the coast as opposed to the inland reaches.

209. RS 24.252 not withstanding. She may be seated beside El (or *il*) but so is Haddu, (*hd*) in the following line and one assumes they are not a pair.

CONCLUSIONS

As the preceding discussion has demonstrated, the notices of Asherah and Astarte in the Hebrew Bible offer very little information concerning the goddesses by those names. In both cases the goddess's name is embedded in formulaic language whose origin is obscured by later editorial layers. However, the formulae themselves are of interest in their development and use.

Astarte in the Hebrew Bible appears as a goddess of the Sidonians or Phoenicians. King Solomon (1 Ki 11) served a goddess ᶜAštôret. In other pericopes she and Baal draw the Israelites away from Yahweh worship. These notices appear only in the book of Judges and 1 Samuel. It seems that the expressions in which Astarte's name appears derive from earlier proscriptions against the worship of "other gods." The impetus for inserting _ᶜštrwt_ into the expressions in unknown.

The Philistines may have offered Saul's and Jonathan's weapons to an "Aštarôt" who was a Canaanite goddess. There is no indication that Astarte was a fertility goddess nor is there any information concerning her cult as it was practiced by Canaanites or Israelites. Her name, when it appears with Baal is the generic, "goddess."

References to the Semitic root _*'šr_ in the Old Testament prove more informative. We determined that the singular _'šrh_ often indicates the deity Asherah though we can be certain in only a few cases. Ahab and Jezebel patronized Asherah of Tyre (1 Ki 18 and associated pericopes). Probably Maacha (1 Ki 15) and Manasseh (2 Ki 21 and 23) also worshipped a goddess Asherah. Again, we have no certain knowledge of cult practices.

The plural *'šrym* invariably refers to cult places or possibly to cult standards. We determined that the goddess's name, Asherah, and the place or object, *'šrh/ym*, are separate lexical items. They may ultimately derive from the same root but comparative Semitics indicates a separation as early as we have records. I do not agree with those who derive the *'šrym* from the goddess's name as a kind of devolved degraded deity.[1] There is some connection between the *'šrh* and other cult objects (one of which is Baal's altar in Ju 6) but not, in the passages cited above, between the *'šrym* and Baal. In these notices we should not see Baal and Asherah as a couple. The expression containing the *'šrym* is sprinkled liberally throughout the *OT* but primarily in Dt and the Dtr literature. We derived the expression from Ex 34.

Certainly at some point in the history of the religion of Israel the two words, Asherah the goddess, and *'šrh/ym* the cult site/object, became confused. It is most apparent in 2 Chronicles which drew heavily on 1 and 2 Kings, but also fabricated notices based on established formulae.[2] The confusion persisted in LXX and in post-Biblical literature.[3] When the goddess was no longer worshipped the word lost any significance and became confused with *'šrh/ym*, the cult spot/object, which had retained a portion of its original meaning.

Asherah, the goddess, is coupled with Baal in the Jezebel pericopes. I suggest the pair, Asherah and Baal, was a Phoenician or North Canaanite phenomenon but it is possible they were also paired farther South.

Analysis of Ugaritic texts concerning Astarte and Asherah allows some insight into their role and character but inevitably raises questions extraneous to the deities. To some degree we can fix their position in the pantheon. I think we can now be more specific than W. F. Albright[4] who said a generation ago that the gods' "... extraordinary fluidity of personality and function is a fluidity which makes it exceedingly hard to fix the domains of different gods or to determine their relation to one another."

Admittedly Astarte at Ugarit presents problems. It is easier to list what she is not than what she is or what she does. Often one is tempted to dismiss her as just another Anat or Anat by a different name. If all references we had were epics and myths, we might be forced to those conclusions. Fortunately the ritual and offering texts treat her as an autonomous goddess with her own cult which was important and highly developed. In the pantheon list, UT 17, she is considered of high rank. Her most distinctive attribute in the Ugaritic literature is that of the huntress. This activity is described in UT 2001 and RS 24.258. She not only goes out hunting or searching but brings food for El.

As in the rest of the ancient Near East there were local manifestations of Astarte, only one of which, named in the Ugaritic literature, Astarte *ḫr*, can be identified with an Ištar name. One is hard pressed to find any equation of Astarte with an Ištar known from the Mesopotamian world. If we had assumed the identification of the two (and given the pre-eminence of Ištar in the ancient world) we would have been forced, as others have been, to equate Astarte=Anat=Ištar, with Anat incorporating Ištar's bellicose attributes and leaving Astarte as a shell with a name. The huntress for the gods is the only area in which we see Astarte as an actor and this has no parallels elsewhere.

The fact that from very early times there was a city *^{c}štrt* in the Syrian steppe indicates an independent Western tradition for the etymological cognates *^{c}štrt/Ištar*.

Hopefully the Ebla finds will help clarify this problem. We know already that Mesopotamian Bara=^{c}Aštarta while Inanna=^{c}Aštar.[5] The co-existence of the two, *^{c}ṯtr* and *^{c}ṯtrt*, in the West is corroborated by the Ugaritic texts. I tend to believe that the problem of the identification of Astarte at Ugarit lies with either her primacy or that of Anat. Anat assumed the majority of the female roles in the mythology due in large part to her identification with her brother/consort Baal. Did she incorporate some of Astarte's functions in her ascendance or are we witness to Astarte's emergence as an individual in the literature from Ugarit? We know from later materials that Astarte becomes far more important than Anat.

The study of Asherah at Ugarit proved most fruitful. Through her we can observe the multi-faceted character of Ugaritic religion and probably also the origins of Ugaritic traditions. In the texts we see her at the interface of two or more cultures or homelands. A decisive desert background contrasts markedly with the coastal/sea locale of many Ugaritic myths and epics.

The birth places and homes of gods (and monsters) are desert lands. Asherah is connected with the deities though we cannot now determine the exact relationship. One of her servants is *qdš w amrr* who can be none other than the Amorite god Amurru, a desert deity, who was in many aspects similar to Baal.

Her coastal character is evident in the appellation *rbt aṯrt ym*, Lady-Aṯirat-of-the-Sea, perhaps an adoptive title to distinguish her from "the other" Aṯirat. Her sea servant is dgy, the fisherman who casts nets into the sea. Though we do not know the name of her home it was probably thought to be in or by the sea. This is confirmed in the Keret epic in which Keret vows to her at Tyre and Sidon. However, she travels by donkey--an appropriate beast for the desert steppe and for royalty.[6]

Her ambivalent attitude towards Baal and El in UT 49, 51 and 52 reflects her dual or composite character. Amurru, a god with functions and attributes similar to Baal,[7] is Aṯirat's earliest recorded consort. Baal at Ugarit was a suitable substitute for Amurru but he was not the chief god, El occupied that position. For a partial reconstruction of their history we suggest that while Aṯirat was adopted into the pantheon Amurru was incorporated into Baal. As chief goddess, Aṯirat was married to El, though to a greater or lesser extent, determined probably by locale, her relation to the storm god (by whatever name) was not forgotten.

On the basis of the evidence presented, I must question the thesis proposed by most scholars that the once happily married couple was, at the time of our discovery, estranged due to El's impotence, senility or loss of political power. The coupling was never complete. If we assume human societal models we have to dig very deep to draw on forms which were neither common nor readily employed by royalty.[8] Husbands and wives seem to have enjoyed particularly close relationships and we should expect nothing different from divine couples.[9]

The eventual coupling of Aṯirat with Baal in Hebrew scripture, especially in those sections dealing with Jezebel (1 Ki 18) is not surprising in this light. The equation of Baal with Amurru is the most likely explanation for those notices. We do not have to see the process as evolutionary. In this case Asherah and Baal may have been a couple from fairly early times after Amurru was replaced by Baal, or more simply, after only Asherah was adopted. We can then dismiss the war of the gods as the primary explanation for Baal's ascendance over El. It seems that he also remained as he was, a storm god, and did not detract from El's functions as creator and stabilizer of the cosmos.

The phenomenon at Ugarit where At̲irat was paired with El seems to have been local. We can only suspect that some other chief goddess, perhaps Elat,[10] was edged aside in favor of At̲irat.

At̲irat had several clearly defined functions at Ugarit. She was El's chief wife, the primary goddess of the pantheon and guardian of succession. In the Keret epic King Keret invoked At̲irat's name to aid him in procuring a wife and progeny. In the Baal cycle she nominated the replacement for fallen Baal. At̲irat's epithet, *qnyt ilm*, indicates her role as creatress of the gods. She had children and a band of kin whom she protected from hostile Baal and Anat. The appellation does not point to a more generalized function as a fertility goddess, though she was said to suckle royal progeny both human and divine. This, was I believe, related to her activity noted above, as guarantor of succession. She was an active goddess who moved in realms accessible to humans and the younger gods.

She belonged to the older generation of gods whose consent was required before younger deities could act. Her approval of Baal's designs was a prerequisite for implementation of those plans. Atirat exercised control of a familial type rather than cosmic or chthonic. Her domain was the affairs of humans and gods.

We do not yet know if she was a sea goddess having any control or power over the oceans. She may have been patroness of ships and sailors and fisherman but this remains to be proven.

Finally it should be apparent that to compare the Ugaritic Astarte and Atirat to their namesakes in the Hebrew Bible is a fairly futile chore. Until we can isolate, describe and define deities in one place we will be unable to make accurate comparisons with their local manifestations.[11] We cannot address the subject of development until we define, within reasonable limits of inference, our subject matter.

NOTES TO CONCLUSIONS

1. Cf. eg., Yamashita, T., *The Goddess Asherah*, 137.

2. My thanks to Professor Sarah Japhet of the Hebrew University for drawing this to my attention. Pericopes in which the Chronicler used standard formulae taken from Kings are 2 Chr 14:2, 19:3, 17:6, 24:18.

3. In Mishnaic texts, Order Nezikim tractate Avodah Zarah part 3 Mishayiot 5,7,8,9,10.

4. *ARI*, 70. M. Dahood, *ASD*, 72, follows Albright.

5. Pettinato, *BA* 39 (1976)2. 49.

6. *Contra*. de Moor *AOAT* 16, 50. "Aṯiratu rides on a donkey rather than on horseback, simply because the latter was rarely practised in the Ancient Near East before the 1st mill. B.C. and certainly not by elderly women like Aṯiratu." Goodness!

7. *WdM*, 97. Kupper, J-R., "L'iconographie du Dieu Amurru," passim.

8. E. G., van Selms, *Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature*, ch. 2 esp. sect. 5.

9. Cf. Keret text. Also Hittite texts which depict royal couples as devoted to each other and enjoying a great degree of equality.

10. Schaeffer, J., "El, Elat et Asherat," passim.

11. See esp. K-H. Bernhardt, "Aschera in Ugarit und im Alten Testament," *MIO* ser. 2, 13(1967), 163ff. Page 168 is a good summary statement.

EXCURSUS: ASTARTE IN EGYPT

A number of Egyptologists have devoted considerable effort to the question of Syro-Palestinian deities in Egypt: their identification, cult, adoption process and function within the Egyptian pantheon. Astarte was among those deities studied. In so far as re-examining the evidence in its proper context is concerned I cannot improve upon the work already done. It is worthwhile, though, in the body of this thesis, to outline the problems and some of the suggested solutions and to examine the iconography in view of the Semitic evidence. There are a few topics germane to Astarte in the Semitic world: her appearance with or on horses, her warlike attributes, Anat and Reshep who are associated with her, and the historical sequence of documents.

The literary evidence for Astarte in Egypt is diverse. She appears first in a Giza stele inscription from the reign of Amenophis II. As a youth he loved horses and was entrusted with the care and training of his father's stable. "Resheph and Astarte (*'stỉrtw*) were rejoicing in him for doing all that his heart desired."[1] There is no Semitic evidence for associating Reshep with Astarte.

Amenophis IV's successor, Tutmosis IV, is called "strong in the chariot as Astarte."[2] To his reign also belongs the first pictorial representation of a riding Astarte.[3]

Tushratta, the King of Mitanni, had close ties with Egypt for he sent to the ailing Amenophis III a statue of *Ištar ša ^{alu}ni-i-na-a* to speed his recovery. There is some controversy as to whether this is the same deity as the earlier *'stỉrtw* or *'3styrt*.[4] Stadelmann[5] ascribes a series of votive artifacts to the "healing Ištar *hr*." These he distinguishes from the Syrian war-like Astarte. We do not know if Ištar of the Hurrians had special healing attributes. There is little to suggest that Astarte of the Syrian world did.[6] Since only two inscriptions to a healing Ištar have been found we might assume this quality to have been a minor one.[7]

From the 19th dynasty comes an inscription or poem written on the king's war chariot.[8] The exact king, Seti I, Rameses II or Merneptah, is unknown. The text in part reads: (12.) as for the hands (dt) (13.) of thy chariot they are Aant (14.) and Astarte. As for the thong (15.) of thy chariot, it (16.) binds those who are evil."[9] Seti I's horse team was called "Anat is content."[10]

Under Rameses II Astarte becomes the patron goddess of Pirameses.[11] Rameses himself took two Astarte names: r'ms.sw mry ^{c}sṯrtt "Rameses beloved of Astarte," and ^{c}strt hr wnm.f, "Astarte is on his right."[12] She is the dynastic protectress. She is one of the four "corner stones" of the new city: "...its west is the House of Amon, its South the house of Seth. Astarte appears in its East and Uto in its North."[13] The four compass points apparently refer to temples at each corner of the city.[14]

A stele from the time of Merneptah calls her ^{c}strt nbt pt hnwt n̂ṯrw nbw "Astarte queen of the heavens and mistress of all the gods."[15] She also appears with Ptah on the stele with shield and spear and composite crown. She is the daughter and beloved of Ptah.

From Bethel, dating also to the 19th dynasty comes a scarab.[16] The inscription reads ^{c}strt and is surrounded on either side by two figures, probably gods. One wears a long tunic and carries a spear in her right hand. The figure to the left of the inscription is not identified but may be another Astarte.[17]

The second Libyan war of Rameses III (20th dynasty) is depicted at Medinat Habu. One of the inscriptions reads: "Montu and Seth are with him in every fray; Anat and Astarte ('-s-ty-r'-t) are a sheild to him."[18]

Also probably from the 20th dynasty comes Chester Beatty Papyrus I.[19] Column III (ii7-iii7) relates the settlement of the battle between Horus and Seth:

> Then Neith, the Great, the god's mother sent a letter to the Ennead saying: "Give the office of Osiris to his son Horus! Don't do these acts of wickedness which are not in their place, or I shall be angry and the sky will crash to the ground! and have the all-lord, the bull residing in Heliopolis told: Double Seth in his property; give him Anat and Astarte your two daughters and put Horus in the place of his father Osiris."[20]

Here Anat and Astarte are Re's daughters. We know later that Seth rapes Anat while she bathes.[21] In the Harris magical papyrus they are the two great goddesses who conceive but do not bear. Their wombs were closed by Horus but opened by Seth.

Finally, the Astarte Papyrus[22] relates a story which is compared to Northwest Semitic mythology.[23] In the mutilated Egyptian version,[24] the sea requires tribute from the Ennead. Renut, the harvest goddess, sends a message to Astarte to come before the Ennead. The carrier is a bird. She is perhaps fetched from the land of the Asiatics and asked, as daughter of Ptah to take the tribute to the sea. She weeps but is found next by the shore of the sea in ragged clothes and torn sandals. Sea calls her a furious and tempestuous goddess and inquires of her ragged state, "are (thy) sandals which (are on thy) feet broken, are thy clothes which are upon thee torn by the going and coming which (thou) hast made in heaven and earth?" The outcome of their exchange seems to be that Sea desired Astarte for his wife and would end his animosity toward the gods if his wish were fulfilled. We do not know if she became his wife and we hear no more about such a relationship whereas we do know of the marriage between Ptah and Astarte.

Positive evidence tells us that from earliest times Astarte was associated with the horse and chariot. We are probably safe in assigning war-like attributes to Astarte in Egypt.

The mythology depicts Astarte in a more familiar setting. In the story of "Astarte and the Sea," the hostile sea is a motif common to the West Semitic world and especially prominent in the Ugaritic mythology.[25] There is no precedent for the action in the Egyptian literature and the story is probably Semitic in origin. There is no further evidence in Egypt of Astarte's relationship with the Sea. We might assume, as have others, that the royal use and representation of Astarte was somewhat different from that of the Semites in residence or temporarily living in Egypt. On the other hand, there is no evidence from the Semitic world that Astarte was patroness of chariot warfare, of the art of horse training or of the technical crafts associated with horses.

At Ugarit we have seen something of a hunting or roaming nature associated with her. There is no mention made of horses and chariots used in the hunt whereas in Egypt, especially in the New Kingdom, hunting in the desert with horses and chariot was a popular activity of the kings.

H. Altenmuller[26] has outlined the history of hunting in Egypt.

Briefly, before the New Kingdom hunting was done on foot with dogs and bows and arrows. Hunting in the desert began in the Middle Kingdom and was elaborated on in the NK with the introduction or use of the wagon pulled by a team/pair of horses.[27] Tutmosis IV was the first to expressly state he hunted in the desert with horse and wagon. The last monumental hunting scene depicts Rameses III hunting wild boars with a lance while soldiers with bows and arrows approach through the marsh. In no case that I know from Egypt is there a hunter depicted riding bare-back. A hunter would presumably carry a weapon but not necessarily a shield. The use of swift horses in the desert or steppe-land to hunt gazelle, deer and wild asses may have allowed the first successful intrusion into the hostile waste. It was a way of taming the wilds. The Syrian deities would naturally be associated with the desert or the steppes of their homeland. We might be able to establish some tenuous connection between the Syrian Astarte who roams the steppe in search of food for the gods and the hunter king who tames the steppe with the help of the native deity.

There is no iconography of Astarte from the Northwest Semitic world save the seal from Bethel. Though several attempts have been made to establish her pictographic representation they have failed.[28] This is, I believe, due primarily to the amorphous, shadowy character which she appears to have played in the religion of the 2d millenium. If we had a clear idea of her role, character and place in the pantheon we would be able to match her with one of the several types of female figurines and reliefs found in numerous excavations in Syro-Palestine. I might add that even those goddesses which, especially at Ugarit, are well defined and represented in the texts cannot be said with certainty to correspond to any of the figurines.

Egypt has proven the most fertile area for finding goddesses depicted and named. Jean Leclant's[29] work on the riding Astarte drew together a sizeable body of material. All of his documents depict an individual mounted on a horse. Six derive from the period of the New Kingdom and two from later periods.

Horses and chariots are generally thought to have been brought to Egypt by the Hyksos.[30] Stadelmann[31] and Helck[32] place the introduction of the worship of Astarte at the beginning of the 18th dynasty and King Amenophis II. Before the period of the New Kingdom Stadelmann[33] proposes a knowledge of Syro-Palestinian gods by the Egyptians but not adoption as is attested for the New Kingdom. What processes were involved in adoption are unknown and the human vehicles, their nationality and purpose, are likewise lost to us. It appears that Astarte did not arrive in Egypt coincident with the horse and chariot--at least if the documentary evidence is a reliable testimony to the date of her adoption. It is also noteworthy that during the period of the 18th dynasty several Asiatic deities were adopted or became popular who would have had no apparent connection with the Hyksos. Thus far there is no obvious reason to associate Astarte with the introduction of horses into Egypt. On re-examining the Ugaritic materials there is no evidence to suggest she had anything to do with horses and only occasionally and most tenuously was she war-like or bellicose.[34] She was more a "huntress" than a warrior.

Leclant's analysis of the documents depicting the so-called "riding Astarte" has been criticized by W. Hermann in his article "Aš-tart."[35] Of all the documents only the Turin Stele[36] possibly bears the name Astarte written defectively.[37] The stele dates from the reign of Tutmosis IV. The riding female wears an atef crown and a collar. She sits "á la Amazone" on a small blanket or saddle and holds a drawn bow over a fallen Nubian. The bow and arrow are found again in Leclant's doc. 9[38] which is the North wall of the cella of the Temple of Hibis. This mural shows three Astartes, two standing and one riding, all hold bow and arrow and the rider holds in addition a javelin. The Temple dates from the Persian period. We assume that by the Persian period Astarte the archer on horseback was a fixed formula. It is noteworthy that three Astartes are presented in a single aspect though two wear the red crown and the rider wears the white crown.

Leclant's corpus includes other items which are not so clearly representations of Astarte. Numbers 2, 9, and 10 (only 9 and 10 with certainty) bear the name Astarte. Numbers 2, 4 and 5 wear the atef crown said to be characteristic of Astarte. The documents of #6 and #7 series do not seem to represent Astarte at all. Schulmann considers, on the basis of the atef crown, Leclant's docs. 2,4,5,7a and 7b to be representations of Astarte. 7a is war-like but a female. 7b, while peaceful is also female. All belong to the 19th dynasty and most were found in and around Thebes. Others which Leclant[40] places together (7c,f and 8) are either of indeterminate sex or male. These belong to either the 19th or 20th dynasties. Documents 1, 6a-c Schulmann[41] places in the late 18th dynasty though they do not represent Astarte. The earliest is a glazed steatite plaque of a rider with weapons. It bears the cartouche of Tutmosis III. The horse's plumes are identical with those of the King's chariot horses.

The indistinct or absent feminine characteristics of many of the riders does not bother Leclant who writes[42] "Ce dernier point [the masculine appearance of several riders] ne constituerait d'ailleurs pas l'objection majeure, puisque le caractère sexual d'Astarté peut présenter une certaine ambiguïté." Whether or not this was true outside Egypt,[43] and it can be disputed within Egypt,[44] the name Astarte is always written with the final feminine /t/ and a determinative for "goddess." One might expect an imported goddess complete with mythology in which she is conceived as female to retain this in the iconography.

How the Egyptians conceived of the Syrian Astarte (if she is indeed the Syrian one) as warrior, patroness of horses, daughter of Rē', wife of Ptah, dynastic protector, is interesting for the history of Egyptian religion particularly the processes which allowed for an internationalization of the pantheon. The Egyptian depiction of Astarte is primarily war-like and she is intimately connected to the King's performance in the chariot. Whether or not it is the war or hunting chariot we do not know. In matters mythological she is at once part of the Egyptian pantheon and separate from it in her relationship with another adoptee, Seth. The story of Astarte and the Sea appears to be an Egyptianized version of a Semitic theme.

Does any of this relate to or inform the Semitic materials and particularly Syria which all assume to be the homeland for the Egyptian Astarte? Her connection with the horse and chariot is unprecedented though she is the huntress in the steppe. Is she then tied to things wild and protectress of the Pharoah in his encounters with the lands to the North and the steppe?

Anat's appearance with Astarte is certainly a clue as to origins. Only in the Northwest Semitic literature from Ras Shamra do we find the two as a fixed pair. Perhaps this was true for the entire North Syrian coast with which the Egyptians had long-standing ties. Though we hear of Astarte in Egypt's myths and records before Anat this is not necessarily indicative of a delay in Egyptian cognizance of her or a lag in her ascendance.[45] Her bellicose nature well attested at Ugarit is verified in Egypt. Astarte stands as an individual vital deity in Egypt while, as we have seen at Ugarit, she often appears as a shadow of Anat. One must assume then that the Astarte adopted by Egypt was recognized as having her own attributes and mode of action apart from Anat. Unfortunately Astarte's range of patronage and action seems to have no direct parallel in the North.

Did the Egyptians adopt an Astarte that we know or not? Either is a possibility. A minor attribute at Ugarit or Byblos could have been the important and lacking feature in the Egyptian pantheon. Conversely, she may be another Astarte of whom we have not yet heard. It is strange that if she arrived with the Hyksos as patroness of horses and chariots we hear of her only in the New Kingdom, somewhat later in the 18th dynasty and she becomes most important only in the 19th dynasty. The Hurrian Ištar, sent to Amenophis III, was a healing goddess, specifically from Mesopotamia. It is equally possible that another Hurrian Astarte, one who had power over horses and chariotry, a prominent feature in Hurrian society, could have been adopted by the Egyptians.

There is no one-to-one equation of Astarte in the Northwest Semitic world and Astarte in Egypt. There are small similarities which together do not make a whole picture and which should not be emphasized to the point at which they obscure a realistic appraisal of her country of origin and namesakes outside of Egypt.

NOTES TO EXCURSUS: ASTARTE IN EGYPT

1. *ANET*, 244-45.

2. *SPGE*, 102, *tn̠r ḥr ssmt my ^{c}3styrt.*

3. Ibid.

4. *SPGE*, 99-102; Helck, W., *Beziehungen*, 490-494; Ranke, "Ištar als Heilgottin in Ägypten," 413-414.

5. *SPGE*, 106-108.

6. UT 2001, possibly.

7. Cf. Ranke, op. cit.

8. Dawson, W. R., and Peet, T.E., "Poem on King's Chariot," *JEA* 19 (1933), 167-174.

9. Ibid., 169.

10. *ANET*, 254.

11. *SPGE*, 105.

12. Ibid.

13. *ANET*, 470.

14. Ibid., note 4.

15. *SPGE*, 104.

16. =Jerusalem seal 60A (34.4442) in A. Rowe, *The Four Canaanite Temples of Beth Shan*, pt. 1, pl. 35:5; 49A:1.

17. Fulco, Wm., *Canaanite God Rešep*, 9f.

18. Breasted, J. H., *Ancient Egyptian Records IV*, section 105. *ANET*, 250. Edgerton, W., and Wilson, J.A., *Historical Records of Rameses III*, 75.

19. Gardiner, A., *Hieratic Papyri*, 61-63. *ANET*, 14-17.

20. After Gardiner, op. cit.

21. Ibid., 61-63.

22. Gardiner, A., "The Astarte Papyrus," 74-85. *ANET*, 17-18.

23. Hermann, W., "Aštart," passim.

24. The story follows Gardiner in "Astarte Papyrus."

25. UT 137 and 68.

26. Jagd in Alten Ägypten, Hamburg, 1967. Cf. pp. 9, 24.34.

27. Edgerton and Wilson. op. cit., 39f, 144-146.

28. See especially, Pritchard, J., Palestinian Figurines in Relation to Certain Goddesses Known Through Literature, 1943.

29. Leclant, J., "Astarté à cheval d'aprés les représentations Égyptiennes," Syria 37(1960). 1-67.

30. Cf. Leclant, Syria. 17 n. 6. Schulman A.R.S., "Egyptian Representations of Horsemen and Riding in the New Kingdom," JNES 16 (1967), 263-271.

31. SPGE, 99f.

32. In WdM, 338.

33. SPGE, 21f.

34. UT 137:7f; 127:56.

35. P. 49f.

36. Leclant, Syria, Doc. 2.

37. Ibid., 34 note 5.

38. Ibid., 49 n. 3. Cf. Fulco, Wm., The Canaanite God Rešep, 20-21, E 49 and note 105.

39. Op. cit., 269.

40. Ibid., 268.

41. Ibid., 264.

42. Op. cit., 35.

43. Ibid., 7 n. 7.

44. Leclant seems to waiver on this point. See his note 6 on page 8.

45. Cf. Charles Bowman's forthcoming dissertation on Anat. As early as the Hyksos period Anat's name appears in the onomastica.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aharoni, Y. *The Land of the Bible*. London: Burns and Oates, 1966.

Aistleitner, J. *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache*. Berlin: Akademieverlag, 1967.

________. *Die mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Schamra*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1959.

________. "Ein Opfertext aus Ugarit," *Acta Orientalia*, 4 (1954), 259-270.

Albright, W. F. *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*. 5th ed. New York: Doubleday, 1969.

________. *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968.

________. "Syria, the Philistines, and Phoenicia," *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. II (fascicle 33). Cambridge, 1966.

________. *From the Stone Age to Christianity*. 2d ed. New York: Doubleday, 1957.

________. "Recent Books on Archaeology and Ancient History," *BASOR*, 139 (1955), 14-24.

________. "A Vow to Asherah in the Keret Epic," *BASOR*, 94 (1944), 20-32.

________. "Astarte Plaques and Figurines from Tel Beit Mirsim," *Melanges syriens offerts a M. Rene Dussaud*, V. I. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1939. Pp. 107-120.

________. *The Excavations of Tell Beit Mirsim*, Vol. II. The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research, No. 17. New Haven: American Schools, 1938.

Alt, A. *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Vokes Israel*, vol. II. Munchen: C. H. Beck'sche, 1953.

Altenmuller, H. *Darstellungen der Jagd im Alten Ägypten*. Die Jagd in der Kunst, Bd. 19. Hamburg: P. Pare, 1967.

Amiran, Ruth. *Ancient Pottery of the Holy Land*. Ramat Gan: Massada, 1969.

Astour, M. C. "Place Names," *Ras Shamra Parallels II*, ed. L. Fisher. Analecta Orientalia, 50. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute. Pp. 249-369.

________. " North Mesopotamian Locale of the Keret Epic?" *UF* 5(1973), 29-39.

________. "Review of G. Buccellati, *The Amorites of the Ur III Period*," *JNES*, 28 (1969), 222-224.

________. "Two Ugaritic Serpent Charms," *JNES*, 27 (1968), 13-36.

________. *Hellenosemitica*. Leiden: Brill, 1967.

________. "Some New Divine Names from Ugarit," *JAOS*, 86 (1966), 227-284.

Attenridge, Harold, and Oden, R.A. *De Dea Syria*. Society for Biblical Literature Texts and Translations, 9: Graeco-Roman Series, no. 1. Missoula Mont.: Scholar's Press, 1975.

Barnett, R. D. *The Sea Peoples*. Cambridge Ancient History, Fascicle 68. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. 1968.

Ben-Dor, I. "A Middle Bronze-Age Temple at Nahariyah," *QDAP*, 14 (1950), 1-42.

Bernhardt, K-H. "Aschera in Ugarit und im Alten Testament," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orient Forschung*, 13 (1967), 163-174.

Beyerlin, W. "Gattung und Herkunft des Rahmens im Richterbuch," *Tradition und Situation*, ed. O. Kaiser. Göttingen, 1963. Pp. 1-29.

Bezold, C. *Babylonisch-Assyrisches Glossar*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1926.

Bleeker, C. J. "The Religion of Ancient Egypt," *Historia Religionum*, Vol. II: *Religions of the Past*. C. J. Bleeker, Leiden: Brill, 1969.

Boling, Robert G. *Judges*. Anchor Bible, 6A. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1975.

Borger, R. "Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien," *AfO Beiheft* 9 (1956), 107-109.

Breasted, J. H. *Ancient Records of Egypt*, vol. IV. Chicago, 1906.

Buccellati, G. *The Amorites of the Ur III Period*. Ricerche, I. Naples: Istituto Orientali di Napoli, 1966.

Burney, C. F. *The Book of Judges*. London, 1930. (Reprint, New York: Ktav, 1970).

Campbell, E. F. *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1964.

Caquot, A. "Les Religions des Semites Occidentaux," *Histoire des Religions*, vol. I. Bruges, 1970.

________. "Nouveaux Documents Ougaritiens," *Syria*, 46 (1969), 241-254.

________. "Le Dieu ^{c}Athtar et les Textes de Ras Shamra," *Syria*, 35 (1958), 45-60.

Caskel, W. "Die alten Semitischen Gottheiten in Arabien," *Le Antiche Divinita Semitiche*, ed. S. Moscati. Studi Semitici, I. Rome: Universita di Roma, 1958. Pp. 95-117.

Cassuto, U. *Biblical and Oriental Studies*, vol. II: *Bible and Oriental Studies*, trans. Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: the Magnes Press, 1975.

________. *The Goddess Anath*, trans. Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: the Magnes Press, 1971.

Childs, Brevard. *The Book of Exodus*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974.

Clemen, C. *Die phönikische Religion nach Philo von Byblos*. Mitteilungen der vorderasiatisch-ägyptische Gesellschaft, vol. 42, 1939.

Clifford, R. J. *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*. Harvard Semitic Monographs, vol. 4. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1972.

Cross, F. M. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1973.

________. "Prose and Poetry in the Mythic and Epic Texts from Ugarit," *HTR*, 67 (1974), 1-9.

________. "The Old Phoenician Inscription from Spain Dedicated to Hurrian Astarte," *HTR*, 64 (1971), 189-195.

Crowfoot, J.W., *Samaria-Sebaste III: The Objects from Samaria*. London: Palestine Exploration Fund, 1957.

________. *Samaria-Sebaste I: The Buildings at Samaria*. London: Palestine Exploration Fund, 1942.

Culican, W. "A Votive Model From the Sea," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, July-December 1976. Pp. 119-123.

Dahood, M. "Ugaritic-Hebrew Syntax and Style," *UF*, 1 (1969), 13-36.

________. *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965.

________. "Textual Problems in Isaia," *CBQ*, 22 (1960), 400-409.

________. "Ancient Semitic Deities in Syria and Palestine, " *Le Antiche Divinita Semitiche*, ed. S. Moscati. Studi Semitici, I. Rome: Universita di Roma, 1958. Pp.65-94.

Danmanville, J. "Un Roi hittite honore Ishtar de Samuḫa," *RHA* 59 (1956), 39-61.

________. "Le ritual d'Ištar de Tamininga: KUB XII:5," *RHA*, 70 (1962), 50-61.

Dawson, W.R. and Peet, T.E. "The So-Called Poem on the King's Chariot," *JEA*, 19 (1933), 167-174.

Delanghe, R. *Les Textes de Ras Shamra Ugarit*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1945.

Delcor, M. "Astarte et la fecondite des Trompeaux en Deut. 7:13 et Paralleles," *UF*, 6 (1974), 7-14.

Dhorme, E. "Textes accadiens transcrits en écriture alphabétique de Ras Shamra," *Revue d' assyriologie*, 37 (1940), 83-96.

________. "A propos de Textes hippiatriques," *Syria*, 5 (1934).

Dietrich, M., Loretz, O., and Sanmartín, J. "Lexikalische und Literarisch Probleme in R.S. 1.2=CTA 32 und R.S. 17.100=CTA App. 1," *UF*, 7 (1975), 147-156.

________. "Zur Ugaritischen Lexikographie, XI," *UF*, 6 (1974), 19-38.

________. "Ugaritische ILIB und Hebraisch *'(w)b* 'Totengeist'," *UF*, 6 (1974), 450-451.

Donner, H., and Röllig, W. *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften*. 3 vols. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1966.

Dossin, G. "Les Inscriptions des Statue de Mari (Campagne 1952)," *CRAIBL*, 1953, 241-242.

Dothan, M. "Ashdod-Seven Seasons of Excavation," *Qadmoniot*, 5 (1972), 2-13. (Hebrew).

Dothan, T. "Anthropoid Clay Coffins from a Late Bronze Age Cemetery Near Deir el-Balaḥ," *IEJ*, 23(1973), pp. 130-146.

________. "Salvage Excavation at Deir el-Balaḥ," *Qadmoniot*, 5 (1972), 21-25. (Hebrew).

________. *The Philistines and their Material Culture*. Jerusalem: Massada, 1967. (Hebrew).

Driver, G. R. *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1956.

Driver, S. R. *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*. Oxford: Oxford Univ., 1913. (Reprint New York: Ktav, 1960).

________. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. New York: Meridian Books, 1956.

Drower, M.S. *Ugarit*. Cambridge Ancient History, fascicle 63. Cambrige: Cambridge Univ., 1968.

Dunand, M. "La piscine du trône d'Astarté dans le temple d' Echmoun à Sidon," *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth*, 24 (1971), 19-26.

Dussaud, R. *Les découvertes de Ras Shamra (Ugarit) et l'Ancien Testament*, 2d ed. Paris: Geunther, 1941.

Edgerton, W., and Wilson J.A. *Historical Records of Rameses III*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, no. 12. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1936.

Edwards, I.E. "A Relief of Qudšu-Astarte-Anath in the Winchester College Collection," *JNES*, 14 (1955), 49-51.

Engnell, I. *Studies in Divine Kingship*. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1943.

Fensham, F.C. "Remarks on Keret 54-59," *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*, 3 (1974), 26-33.

________. "The Son of a Handmaid in Northwest Semitics," *VT*, 19 (1969), 312-314.

Fisher, L. "Literary Genres in the Ugaritic Texts," *Ras Shamra Parallels II*, ed. L. Fisher. Analecta Orientalia, 50. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1975. 131-152.

Fitzgerald, G. M. *The Four Canaanite Temples of Beth-Shan*. Pt. II, *The Pottery*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1930.

Fitzmyer, J. *Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*. Biblica et Orientalia, 19. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967.

________. "The Phoenician Inscription from Pyrgi," *JAOS*, 86 (1966), 288-289,

Fohrer, Georg. *Introduction to the Old Testament*, trans. D. Green. New York: Abingdon, 1968.

Frankfort, Henri. *Kingship and the Gods*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago, 1948.

Frymer, T.S. "Ashtoreth," *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 3. Jerusalem: Keter, 1971. Cols. 738-739.

Fulco, W.J. *The Canaanite God Resep*. American Oriental Series Essay, 8. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1976.

Gardiner, Alan H. *The Contendings of Horus and Seth from Pap. Chester Beatty* I: *Late Egyptian Stories I*. Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca, I, 1931.

________. *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum*: Third Series, *Chester Beatty Gift*, I. London, 1935.

________. "The Astarte Papyrus," *Studies Presented to F. Ll. Griffith*. Oxford, 1932 Pp.74-85.

Gaster, T. *Thespis*. New York: Harper, 1961.

________. "The Egyptian Story of Astarte and the Ugaritic Poem of Baal," *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 9 (1952).

________. "Groupings of Deities in the Ritual Tariffs from Ras-Shamra Ugarit," *AfO*, 12 (1937), 148-151.

________. "The Harrowing of Baal," *Acta Orientalia*, 16 (1937), 41-48.

Gelb, I. J. *Glossary of Old Akkadian*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago, 1957.

________. "The Early History of the West Semitic Peoples," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, 15 (1961), 27-47.

Gibson, J.C.L. *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971 and 1975.

________. "Myth, Legend and Folk-Lore in the Ugaritic Keret and Aqhat Texts," *VTS*, 28 (1975), 60-68.

Ginsberg, H.L. "Ugaritic Myths, Epics and Legends," *ANET*, 128-155.

________. *The Legend of King Keret. A Canaanite Epic of the Bronze Age*. *BASOR* Supplementary Studies, vols. 2 and 3. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1946.

________. "The North-Canaanite Myth of Anath and Aqhat," *BASOR*, 97 and 98 (1945), 3-10 and 15-22.

________. "Ba^{c}lu and His Brethren," *JPOS*, 16 (1936), 138-157.

Gordon, C.H. "El, Father of ŠNM," *JNES*, 35 (1976), 261-262.

________. *Ugaritic Textbook*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965.

________. *Ugaritic Literature*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1949.

Gray, John. *Joshua, Judges and Ruth*. Nelson: London, 1967.

_______. *The KRT Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra*, 2d ed. Leiden: Brill, 1964.

_______. *The Legacy of Canaan*. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*, vol. 5. Leiden: Brill, 1957.

Grintz, J.M. "Some Observations on the "High-Place" in the History of Israel," *VT*, 27(1977), 111-113.

Gröndahl, Frauke, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967.

Hamburger, H. "A Hoard of Syrian Tetradrachms and Tyrian Bronze Coins from Gush Halav," *IEJ*, 4 (1954), 201-226.

Harris, Z.S. *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1936.

Haussig, H.W., ed. *Wörterbuch der Mythologie*, vol. I: *Götter und Mythen im Vorderen Orient*. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett, 1965.

Helck, W. *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien in 3. und 2. Jahrtausen v. Chr*. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen, Bd. 5. Wiesbaden, 1971.

_______. *Jagd und Wild im Alten Vorderasien*. Die Jagd in der Kunst, Bd. 23. Hamburg: P. Parey, 1968.

Held, Moshe. "mḫṣ/*mḫš in Ugaritic and Other Semitic Languages," *JAOS*, 79 (1959), 169-176.

Herdner, Andrée. *Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques*. 2 vols. Paris: Imprémerie Nationale, 1963.

Hermann, W. "Aštart," *Mittelungen des Instituts für Orient Forschung*, 15 (1969), 1-55.

Höfner, Maria. "Südarabien," *WdM*, 485-552.

Huffmon, H. *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts*. Baltimore, 1965.

James, F.W. *The Iron Age at Beth Shan: A Study of Levels VI-IV*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1966.

Jastrow, M. *A Dictionary of Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literatures*. New York: Pardes, 1950.

Jepsen, A. "Ama^{h} und Schiphcha^{h}," *VT*, 8 (1958), 293-296.

Jirku, Anton. *Der Mythus der Kanaanaer*. Bonn: Habelt, 1966.

Kaiser, Otto. *Die mythologische Bedeuting des Meeres in Agypten, Ugarit und Israel*, 2nd ed. *BZAW*, 78. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1962.

Kapelrud, A.S. "Temple Building, a Task for Gods and Kings," *Orientalia*, 32 (1963), 56-63.

________. *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts*. Coepnhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1952.

Katzenstein, H.J. *The History of Tyre from the Beginning of the Second Millenium BCE Until the Fall of the Neo-Babylonian Empire in 538 BCE*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1973.

Kaufmann, Y. *The Religion of Israel*, trans. M. Greenberg. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago, 1963.

Keel, Othmar. "Das Vergrabender "Fremden Götter" in Genesis XXXV 4b," *VT*, 23 (1973), 305-336.

Knudtzon, J.A. *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*. Leipzig: Aalen, 1915.

Kupper, Jean Robert. *L'iconographie du Dieu Amurru dans la glyptique de la I^{re} dynastie babylonienne*. Bruxelles, 1961.

________. *Les nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1957.

Lane, E.W. *An Arabic-English Lexicon*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1863. (Reprint U.S.A, 1955).

Langlamet, F. "Isräel et 'L'Habitant du Pays'," *RB* 76(1969), 321-350 and 481-507.

Larôche, E. "Notes sur le panthéon houritte de Ras Shamra," *JAOS*, 88 (1968), 148-150.

Leclant, Jean. "Astarté à cheval d'aprés les représentations Égyptiennes," *Syria*, 37 (1960), 1-67.

Levin, B. "Ugaritic Descriptive Texts," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, 17 (1963), 105-111.

Lipiński, E. "La légende sacrée de la conjuration des morsures de serpents," *UF*, 6 (1974), 169-194.

________. "Recherches Ugaritiques," *Syria*, 50 (1973), 35-51.

________. "Banquet en l'Honneur de Baal CTA 3(V AB), A, 4-22," *UF*, 2 (1970), 75-88.

Liverani, M., ed. *La Siria nel Tardo Bronzo*. Oriens Antiqui Collectio, 9.

Rome: Centro per le Antichità e la Storia dell'Arte del Vicino Oriente, 1969.

Løkkegaard, F. "The House of Baal," *Acta Orientalia*, 22 (1955), 10-28.

Loewenstamm, S.E. "Anat's Victory Over the Tunnanu," *JSS*, 20 (1975), 22-27.

________. "The Muzzling of the Tannin in Ugaritic Myth," *IEJ*, 9 (1959), 260-261.

________. "mṣd," *UF*, 3 (1971), 357-359.

MacKenzie, D. *Excavations at Ain Sehms*. Annual of the Palestine Exploration Fund, 2, 1912-13.

Margulis, B. "A Ugaritic Psalm (RS 24.252)," *JBL*, 89 (1970), 292-304.

Mazar, A. "A Philistine Temple at Tell Qasile," *BA*,36 (1973), 43-47.

________. "Excavations at Tell Qasile," *IEJ*, 23 (1973), 65-71.

Meissner, B. *Babylonien und Assyrien*. Heidelberg, 1925.

Mercer, S. "Astarte in Egypt," *Egyptian Religion*, 3 (1935), 192-203.

Meshel, Zev. "The Name of the God in the Wilderness of Zin," *BA*, 39 (1976), 6-10.

Milgrom, J. "Profane Slaughter and a Formulaic Key to the Composition of Deuteronomy," *HUCA*, 47 (1976). (In press.)

________. *Studies in Levitical Terminology I: The Encroacher and the Levite, The Term ^{c}Aboda*. University of California Publications in Near Eastern Studies, vol. 14. Berkeley: Univ. of California, 1970.

Montgomery, J.A. "Ras Shamra Notes V. A Myth of Spring," *JAOS*, 56 (1936), 226-231.

________. "Notes on the Mythological Epic Texts from Ras Shamra," *JAOS*, 53 (1933), 97-123.

Moor, J.C. de. *New Year with Canaanites and Israelites*. 2 vols. Kamper Cahiers, No. 21. Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1972.

________. *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba^{c}lu*. *AOAT*, vol. 16. Neukirchen-Vlüyn: Kerelaer, Butzon & Bercker, 1971.

________. "Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra II," *UF*, 2 (1970), 301-327.

________. "The Semitic Pantheon of Ugarit," *UF*, 2 (1970), 187-228.

________. "Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra I," *UF*, 1 (1969), 168-188.

________. "Ugaritic *hm*-Never 'Behold'," *UF*, 1 (1969), 201-203.

Moscati, S. *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1969.

Nakata, Ichiro. *Deities in the Mari Texts*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1974.

Nielsen, E. "The Burial of Foreign Gods," *Studia Theologica*, 8 (1955), 103-122.

Noth, Martin. *Exodus*. Philadelphia, Westminster, 1962.

________. *Könige*. Altes Testament, Bd. 9. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1964.

Nougayrol, Jean. "Textes Suméro-Accadiens des Archives et Bibliothèques Privées d'Ugarit," *UG V*, 1-324.

________. "Nouveaux Textes d'Ugarit en Cunéiformes Babyloniens," *CRAIBL*, 1957, 77-86.

________. *Le Palais Royale d'Ugarit*, vols. III,IV. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1955, 1956.

Obermann, Julian. *Ugaritic Mythology*. New Haven, 1948.

Oden, R.A., Jr. *Studies in Lucian's de Syria Dea*. Harvard Semitic Monographs, vol. 15. Missoula Mont.: Scholar's Press, 1977.

Parker, S.B. "The Ugaritic Deity Rapī'u," *UF*, 4 (1972), 97-105.

________, and Ferrara, A.J. "Seating Arrangments at Divine Banquets," *UF*, 4 (1972), 37-39.

Parrot, A. *Le Temple d'Ištar*. Paris, 1956.

Pettinato, Giovanni. "The Royal Archives of Tell-Mardikh-Ebla," *BA*, 39 (1976), 44-54.

Plessis, J. *Étude sur les textes coniernant Ištar-Astarté*. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1921.

Pope, Marvin. *El in the Ugaritic Texts*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, vol. II. Leiden: Brill, 1955.

________. "A Divine Banquet at Ugarit," *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays*, ed. J. M. Efird. North Carolina:

Duke Univ. Press, 1972. 170-203.

________. "Review of John Gray, Legacy of Canaan," JSS, 11 (1966), 228-241.

________. "Marginalia to M. Dahood's Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology," JBL, 65 (1966), 455-466.

________, and Röllig, W., "Syrien: Die Mythologie der Ugariter und Phönizier," WdM, 219-312.

________. "The Saltier of Atargatis Reconsiderd," Near Eastern Archaeology in the 20th Century, ed. J. A. Sanders. New York: Doubleday, 1970. 178-195.

Porter, B., and Moss R. Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings, vol. I, pt. i. Oxford: Oxford Univ., 1960.

Pritchard, J.B., ed. Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, Supplementary Texts and Pictures. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ., 1969.

________. Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ., 1955.

________. The Ancient Near East in Pictures. Princeton, N.J: Princeton Univ., 1954.

________. Palestinian Figurines in Relation to Certain Goddesses Known Through Literature. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1943.

Rainey, Anson. "Family Relationships in Ugarit," Orientalia, 34 (1965), 10-22.

________. Social Stratification of Ugarit. Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis Univ., 1962. (Univ. Microfilms No. 63-5836).

Ranke, Hermann, "Ištar als Heilgottin in Ägypten," Studies Presented to F. Ll. Griffith, ed. S.R.K. Glanville. London: Oxford Press, 1932. 412-418.

Reed, Wm. The Asherah in the Old Testament. Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian Univ. Press, 1949.

Rin, Svi. Acts of the Gods, the Ugaritic Epic Poetry. Jerusalem, 1968. (Hebrew).

Roberts, J.J.M. The Earliest Semitic Pantheon. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1972.

Rofé, A. "The Strata of the Law about the Centralization of Worship in

Deuteronomy and the History of the Deuteronomic Movement," *VT*, 22 (1972), 221-226.

Rowe, Alan. *The Four Canaanite Temples of Beth Shan*, pt. 1. Philadelphia, 1940.

________. *A Catalogue of Egyptian Scarabs in the Palestine Archaeological Museum*. Jerusalem, 1936.

________. *The Topography and History of Beth Shan*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1930.

Ryckmans, G., *Les Religions Arabes Préislamiques*. Bibliothèque de Muséon, vol. 26. Louvain, 1951.

Schaeffer, Cl. F.A. "El, Elat et Asherat," *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*, A. Caquot and M. Philonenko eds. Paris: Adrien-Maissonneuve, 1971. 137-149.

________. *Ugaritica*. Vols. I-V. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1939-1968.

Schulman, A.R. "Egyptian Representations of Horsemen and Riding in the New Kingdom," *JNES*, 16 (1957), 263-271.

Smith, W. Robertson. *The Religion of the Semites*. New York, 1972 (reprint of 2d ed. 1894).

Soggin, J.A. *Joshua*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972.

Stadelmann, Rainer. *Syrisch-pälestinische Gottheiten in Ägypten*. Probleme der Ägyptologie, Bd. 5. Leiden, 1967.

Tallqvist, Knut. *Akkadische Götterepithete*. Studia Orientalia, vol. 7, 1938.

Thompson, H.O. "Tell el-Husn Beth-Shan," *BA*, 30 (1967), 110-135.

Todd, Sally. *The Philistines*. Nov. 1967. (Unpublished mimeographed paper).

Urie, D.M.L. "Sacrifice Among the Semites," *PEQ*, 1949, 67-82.

van Driel, G. *The Cult of Aššur*. Assen, 1969.

van Selms, A. "The Fire in Yammu's Palace," *UF*, 3 (1971), 249-252.

________. "CTA 32: A Prophetic Liturgy," *UF*, 3 (1971), 237-248.

________. *Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature*. London, 1954.

Vaughan, P.H. *The Meaning of 'Bāmâ' in the Old Testament*. Society for Old Testament, Monograph Series, vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. 1974.

Virolleaud, Ch. "Les Nouveaux Texts Mythologiques et Liturgiques de Ras Shamra," *UG V*, (1968), 545-606.

________. "Le Festin du Pere des dieux," *PRU V*, (1965), 545-551.

________. "Fragments de Tablettes du Four: Fragment d'une tablette oniromantique," *PRU V*, (1965), 189-190.

________. "Fragments Mythologiques et Liturgiques," *PRU V*, (1965), 1-5.

________. "Les Nouvelles Tablettes Alphabētiques de Ras Shamra (XIX^e Campagne, 1955)." *CRAIBL*, 1956, 60-62.

________. *La Lēgende de Keret Roi des Sidoniens*, Paris: Geuthner, 1936.

________. "Fragments d'un traité phénicien de thérapeutique hippologique," *Syria*, 15 (1934), 75-83.

Wakeman, Mary K. *God's Battle with the Monster*. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Ward, Wm. A. "La Déesse Nourricière d'Ugarit," Syria, 46 (1969), 223-239.

Weidner, E. "Neue Entdeckungen in Ugarit," *AfO*, 18 (1957/8), 167-170.

Weinfeld, M. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Oxford Univ., 1972.

________. "The Worship of Molech and the Queen of Heaven and its Background," *UF*, 4 (1972), 133-154.

________. "The Period of the Conquest and of the Judges as Seen by the Earlier and Later Sources," *VT*, 17 (1967), 93-113.

Weippert, M. "Ein ugaritischer Beleg für das Land 'Qadi' der ägyptischen Texte?" *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-vereins*, 85 (1969), 35-50.

Weiser, Artur. *Samuel: seine geschichtlich Aufgabe und religiose Bedeutung*. Göttingen, 1962.

Whitaker, Richard. *A Concordance of the Ugaritic Literature*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1972.

Wiseman, David. "The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon," *Iraq*, 20 (1958).

Wreszinski, Walter. *Atlas zur altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte*, 2 vols. Leipzig, 1935.

Yamashita, Tadanori. The Goddess Asherah. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1964.

Yaron, R. "A Royal Divorce at Ugarit," Orientalia, 32 (1963), 21-31.

Zevit, Z. "The So-Called Interchangeability of the Prepositions b, l and m(n) in Northwest Semitic," JANES, 7 (1975), 103-112.

Zijl, Peter J. van. Baal: A Study of Texts in Connection with Baal in the Ugaritic Epics. AOAT, vol. 10. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Kerelaer, Butzon and Bercker, 1971